

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 133

UD 024 433

AUTHOR Seltzer, Richard; Thompson, Edward, III
TITLE Attitudes towards Discrimination and Affirmative Action for Minorities and Women.
INSTITUTION Howard Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Urban Affairs and Research.
PUB DATE Feb 85
NOTE 140p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Urban Affairs and Research, Howard University, 2900 Van Ness Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20008 (\$5.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Affirmative Action; *Black Attitudes; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Federal Programs; Females; *Public Opinion; Racial Differences; *Racial Discrimination; Sex Differences; *Whites

ABSTRACT

Public attitudes toward affirmative action and racial discrimination were measured in a telephone survey of 648 respondents in the Washington, DC metropolitan area. In addition to focusing on how government affirmative action policies impact on racial minorities and women, the study investigated individual attitudes on the extent of racial discrimination at the workplace and in society. The survey produced four major findings: (1) there are significant differences in the attitudes on affirmative action held by Blacks and Whites; (2) the attitudes held by "advantaged" (high income and/or middle or upper class) Blacks differ from those of less advantaged Blacks; (3) White women and Blacks differ significantly in their attitudes on the perceived major beneficiaries of affirmative action. White women are more supportive of affirmative action programs than are White males, but these differences are small when compared to interracial differences; and (4) on abstract questions, well-educated Whites hold more liberal attitudes on affirmative action than less-educated Whites. However, there are no significant differences between well and poorly educated Whites when they are asked to support applied policies advancing affirmative action. These findings suggest that affirmative action has been more successful in promoting debate than in increasing employment opportunities for a growing number of structurally unemployed Blacks. (KH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lawrence E. Gary
Howard Univ Inst for
Urban Affairs & Research

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

**ATTITUDES TOWARDS DISCRIMINATION AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION
FOR MINORITIES AND WOMEN**

by

**Richard Seltzer, Ph.D.
Edward Thompson III, Ph.D.**

**Institute for Urban Affairs and Research
Howard University
Washington, D.C. 20008**

February 1985

Library of Congress Card Catalogue Number 85-060545

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	Page 2
Research Hypotheses	5
Methodology	19
Improvement of Conditions	21
Does Discrimination Continue as a Problem?	23
Discrimination in Education, Employment, and Housing	26
Discrimination at the Workplace: Race	32
Discrimination at the Workplace: Sex	40
Extent of Personal Discrimination	45
Attitudes toward Affirmative Action Programs	51
Who Benefits from Affirmative Action?	64
Who Opposes Affirmative Action?	75
Discussion of Findings	84
Conclusions	93
Footnotes	96
Bibliography	103
Tables	106

INTRODUCTION

Historically, race has had a dominant influence on American life. The effects of racism have, perhaps, been strongest in the area of employment. The influence of race in the labor market became manifest after the Civil War when newly freed Blacks began competing for employment opportunities with Whites. These freed Blacks were often exploited by management and physically attacked by White workers who feared economic competition from Blacks. As Oliver Cromwell Cox (1948) has noted, racial conflict frequently reflects the unstated economic concerns of different ethnic and social groups.

Affirmative action programs are a contemporary response to historic patterns of racially based employment discrimination. Initial government efforts to address racially based employment discrimination, such as the Unemployment Relief Act of 1933, the Fair Employment Practices Committees of the 1940's, and the Executive Orders issued during the 1950's and 1960's, were generally ineffective. These early efforts had a limited impact because there was an absence of standards by which discrimination could be identified, as well as a lack of strong sanctions and enforcement procedures.[1]

The affirmative action policies and programs developed during the 1960's sought to address these concerns by implementing procedures to increase the utilization and representation of

racial minorities and women in education and employment. The concept of affirmative action was provided operational meaning when the U.S. Department of Labor issued guidelines which averred that an "underutilization" of minorities and women occurred when there were fewer minorities and women in a particular job classification than reasonably would be expected in the absence of discrimination. The concept gained with regard to enforcement meaning in 1965, when the U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare (HEW) and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) were granted the authority to force compliance with these operational guidelines.[2]

Not surprisingly, major battles have been waged over the meaning and interpretation of affirmative action. Opponents of the concept, such as Thomas Sowell, contend that measures which take race into account "stigmatize" minorities as inferior.[3] It is also asserted that affirmative action constitutes "reverse discrimination" because "some White men will undoubtedly feel, and some may in fact be, deprived of certain opportunities as a result of affirmative action plans" (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981:36).[4] Finally, it is charged that affirmative action abandons the traditional American concern for individual rights and equity, while replacing them "with a concern for rights for publicly determined and delimited racial and ethnic groups"(Glazer, 1975:197).

Supporters of affirmative action utilize a combination of empirical evidence and normative theory to justify their position. First, they suggest that "the blatant racial and sexual discrimination originated in our often forgotten past...continues to affect the present" (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981:7). Second, it is asserted that the "universalistic/merit" standards utilized for selection: vary over time; are socially defined, and are interconnected to a structure of privilege developed by dominant social groups (Duster, 1976:73). Third, affirmative action is viewed as an instrument of distributive justice which promises to reduce existing social inequities (Smith, 1982). Finally, supporters suggest that affirmative action contributes to the general public welfare by more fully utilizing all social groups, and "uncovering and changing general organizational deficiencies" (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981:37).

In March of 1983, we measured public attitudes toward affirmative action and racial discrimination in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. Our telephone survey of 648 respondents was particularly concerned with the public's perception of the beneficiaries and opponents of affirmative action. In addition to focusing on how government affirmative action policies impacted on racial minorities and women, we also measured individual attitudes on the extent of racial discrimination at the workplace and in society.

In developing the survey, we posited four major hypotheses which were influenced by the findings of previous researchers. These hypotheses are listed below:

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

- Hyp 1- There will be significant differences in the attitudes on affirmative action held by Blacks and Whites.
- Hyp 2- There will be significant differences in the attitudes held by "advantaged" (high income and/or middle or upper class) Blacks, and less advantaged (low income and/or working class) Blacks.
- Hyp 3- There will be significant differences in the attitudes held by White women and Blacks on the perceived major beneficiaries of affirmative action.
- Hyp 4- On ABSTRACT questions, well educated Whites will hold more liberal attitudes on affirmative action than will less educated Whites. However, there will be no significant differences between well and poorly educated Whites when they are asked to support APPLIED policies advancing affirmative action.

Hypothesis 1: Discussion

As noted above, our first hypothesis was that there would be significant differences in the attitudes of Blacks and Whites regarding affirmative action. Although there is some recent evidence that the attitudes of Blacks and Whites regarding affirmative action are becoming more similar (see Public Opinion April/May 1981, pp. 32-40), we did not expect Blacks and Whites to extend equal support for the program.[5] First, Blacks are more obvious and immediate beneficiaries of affirmative action than Whites are. Second, many of the questions suggesting a

convergence in attitude are abstract in nature. Such abstract questions do not present realistic situations to respondents. For example, White and Black attitudes with regard to residential integration are closer today than they were in the past. However, many Whites will not consider this type of situation to be realistic or threatening due to the continuing de facto segregation and the general poverty of large number of Blacks who are therefore unable to move into White neighborhoods.

By way of contrast, we expected questions on affirmative action to elicit greater differences between Blacks and Whites because this policy is viewed by many Whites to be a concrete threat. First, many Whites believe that affirmative action programs have effectively operated on behalf of Blacks. Such Whites, it should be noted, might be more likely than would others to feel threatened by affirmative action. Second, affirmative action is a policy which many Whites may view as a "zero-sum" option. In other words, Whites might oppose this policy because it imposes "costs" which they pay in the form of reduced employment options. Similarly, Blacks will support affirmative action because they can "benefit" as their employability increases. Therefore, to the extent that Whites perceive affirmative action imposing costs to them while providing benefits to Blacks, Whites might oppose affirmative action. Third, we believed that Whites would subjectively justify their opposition

to affirmative action by noting how it works against their self-interest, or by referring to the normative arguments advanced by intellectual opponents of the concept. In actuality, however, this opposition reflects the residue of political and value socialization from an earlier period when racist sentiments against Blacks were more acceptable. Since overt racism is no longer socially acceptable, these Whites now advance symbolic values in voicing opposition to affirmative action.[6]

Our first research hypothesis is also based on the findings of surveys conducted by previous researchers. Lipset and Schneider (Public Opinion, March/April 1978; and New Society, April 1978) analyzed the results of nearly 100 polls on racial issues taken between 1935 and 1978. They found Whites were consistently more opposed to specific applications of affirmative action than Blacks were. For example, an October 1977 New York Times /CBS survey found that 60% of Whites disapproved of requirements that businesses hire a certain number of minority workers, while 64% of Blacks approved of such requirements. Relatively similar findings were reported in polls conducted by Bolce and Gray (1979) and Sackett (1980).

One interesting feature of the surveys discussed above is that each of the authors writing in a neo-conservative journal contends that the differences in the attitudes of Blacks and Whites are not as great as is commonly assumed (Glenn, 1975).

Hence, Bolce and Gray posited that a "lack of polarization is the rule, rather than the exception" (1978:67). We question the extent to which this view applies because Bolce and Gray do not precisely state what degree of difference must be obtained in order to be wider than "expected." We would strongly suggest that when a majority of Blacks support a measure which is opposed by a majority of Whites (New York Times/ CBS News survey), there is a wide interracial difference in attitudes between Blacks and Whites. Similarly, a poll conducted by Louis Harris and Associates for the National Conference of Christians and Jews (1978) found that Blacks felt by a 75% to 15% margin that business and education would reduce the selection of Blacks if there were no quotas. By way of contrast, Whites were split on this issue 45% to 42%. Equally large differences were presented in a 1983 Newsweek poll of college students. It found that 66% of Blacks and only 31% of Whites felt that providing preferences to minorities was a good idea. When this same poll asked whether universities should make stronger efforts to recruit minorities, 66% of Blacks agreed compared to only 22% of Whites. On balance, these findings suggest a fairly sharp split in the attitudes Whites and Blacks hold on affirmative action.

We also disagree with Bolce and Gray because we believe that Blacks' affirmative action attitudes differ from those of Whites due to the greater sense of racial groups consciousness

and identification among Blacks. To a great extent, the heightened consciousness of Blacks reflects the impact of racially salient events in the 1960's and 1970's. The passage of major civil rights legislation, urban rebellions, and the establishment of racially sensitive programs such as affirmative action, acted to increase the racial group consciousness and identity of Black Americans.

As the tensions of the 1960's and early 1970's increased, the political conceptualizations of Blacks became more influenced by Blacks' perceptions of how a particular policy, such as affirmative action, would impact on Black Americans as a racial group. This line of reasoning has been most persuasively developed by Hagner and Pierce (1984:233), who note:

In the mid-1960's, Black Americans responded to the relevance of salient political conflict for their shared social/political status by significant increases in the use of group benefit concepts for the evaluation of politics. Even in the 1980's Black conceptualization is linked to subjective racial identification and to differences in evaluations of racial groups.

Similar to Hagner and Pierce, we believe that Blacks' political attitudes are more influenced than Whites by individual feelings about their racial group and how a particular policy will impact on the individual's racial group. Moreover, it is

likely the greater group consciousness among Blacks will contribute to a heightened perception of group self-interest. Given the racial consciousness of Blacks, there should be significant differences in the affirmative action attitudes of Blacks and Whites.

Hypothesis 2: Discussion

Our second research hypothesis suggests that fairly broad differences will emerge in the attitudes of Blacks of different economic classes. In part, this hypothesis, is derived from the work of William Julius Wilson (1980) who posited that the life chances of younger Blacks are increasingly determined by their economic class. We reasoned that those Blacks who find their life chances affected primarily by class would hold attitudes which were significantly different from those of other Blacks. In particular, we hypothesized that class would be a major influence in policy areas, with one class of Blacks perceiving government policy as strictly benefiting the interests of another class group.

Historically, the attitudes held by Blacks from different classes have varied relatively little. However, two factors suggest race may be losing its saliency in some (but by no means all) areas. First, the most obvious manifestations of racial discrimination were ended by the passage of civil rights legislation in the 1960's. Second, new evidence suggests a growing

economic schism between Blacks from different economic classes (Thompson, forthcoming).

The second research hypothesis was also proposed because of recent changes which have occurred in the political system. Over the course of the last generation, the goals sought by Blacks have undergone major transformations. Traditionally, Black organizations sought broad and somewhat intangible goals that provided equal benefit to all Blacks (Thompson, 1984). For example, the somewhat abstract and symbolic goals of "freedom" and "equality" sought by Black political organizations were objectives which were intended to be shared by Blacks regardless as to their social status. These "collective" or "public" goods were nondivisible. In effect, these were positive goals which all classes of Blacks could share.

During the period of Jim Crow racial segregation, all Blacks were potential victims of racial discrimination. Given the stark reality of racism, most Blacks were forced to approach discrimination in a similar fashion. Moreover, the major Black political organizations previously sought collective goods which all Blacks could share. In addition, these early goals were advocated by extremely popular national leaders and organizations. Finally, uniformity of Black attitudes was further reinforced by the fact that so many Blacks were clustered at the bottom of the economic ladder.

Our second research hypothesis further assumes that different classes of Blacks will hold attitudes which are class specific on programs that provide selective benefits to some groups of Blacks. Hence, we hypothesize that Blacks, in a fashion similar to Whites, will advance attitudes they perceive as supporting their particular class interests. Despite this hypothesis, however, we still expect all classes of Blacks to be more supportive of affirmative action than are Whites. We also expect Blacks to be more supportive of benefits for groups which have been discriminated against.

There is some support for our research assumptions. A national poll conducted by ABC News and the Washington Post in February of 1981 suggests significant intraracial attitude differences when respondents are separated by educational background and age. For example, the survey found greater agreement between young, college educated Blacks and their White counterparts, than between either of these young, educated respondents and other members of their respective races. The similarity in the attitudes of these two groups held constant when racial groups were divided according to both education and age (Public Opinion April/May 1981, p. 37). Since Wilson (1980) suggests that the life chances of young, educated Blacks are influenced more by class than race, this finding provides some support for his position.

Hypothesis 3: Discussion

Our third research hypothesis assumes that the attitudes on affirmative action held by Blacks and White women will be significantly different. This hypothesis contradicts many recent opinion polls which suggest that White women are becoming significantly more liberal in their attitudes than are White men. Given this liberalization, and the fact that White women have benefited from affirmative action, one might logically assume that White women would hold attitudes relatively close to those of Blacks. However, this view was rejected based on our interpretation of other factors. First, liberal attitudes on political issues do not automatically translate into liberal attitudes on racial issues. In other words, White women may be less supportive of conservative politicians, but they are not automatically becoming more supportive of Blacks.

This view is supported by a recent survey on racial attitudes. The survey found no significant differences in the attitudes of White women and White men when they were asked whether the government was spending "too little, about right, or too much" on improving the conditions of Blacks. Hence, 28% of White men, and 27% of White women held the view that the government was spending too little on improving the conditions of Blacks. This finding suggests that White women, if anything are less liberal than White men are. It is interesting to note,

however, that White women did become more liberal when they were perceived to be the major beneficiaries of government spending. (Public Opinion, April/May 1982, p. 29). Accordingly, the liberalization in the attitudes of White women might be a function of self-interest and not of general ideology.

Our third research hypothesis is also based on an analysis of the relative benefits which designated groups have actually received from affirmative action. For example, a comprehensive analysis of the relative occupational status of White women, Blacks, and Hispanics by industry suggests that White women are the primary beneficiaries of affirmative action. This study, which was conducted by Howard University sociologist Jonnie Daniel (1982), examined the differential success each of these groups enjoyed in their attempts to obtain high status jobs across labor market segments. Comparisons were made between Black and White males and females for 92 industries. Daniel found the relative occupational status of White women was significantly greater than that for either Black women or Black men. For example, the average occupational status score for White women across all 92 industries was 96.7. By way of contrast, the highest score for Black men in any industry was 87.7. It is equally important to note that the average score for Black women was a miniscule 80.4. Moreover, the relative occupational status of White women in many industries was above 100 (this score

indicates utilization which matches a group's percentage of the population).

Given the relatively advantaged socio-economic status of White women, we believed that Blacks would perceive White women as the major beneficiaries of affirmative action. In interpreting the findings of the Daniel study, it should be remembered that many of the White women occupying positions may hold low-level low-paying jobs. Nonetheless, the fact they are employed to a greater extent than are Black men and Black women suggests they enjoy relatively greater success under affirmative action policies in hiring than do underemployed or unemployed Black men and women. Additional support for this view comes from the fact that under affirmative action, White women have made the largest gains in professional and technician job categories. Hence, a government report (GAO, 1981:5) noted the largest improvements among designated groups occurred "especially (among) White women in the professional and technician categories where their underrepresentation gaps were reduced from 9.0% and 8.3%, to 1.3% and 0.6% respectively."

Given the relative occupational hiring success of White women under affirmative action, we hypothesized that many Blacks would perceive White women as one of the major beneficiaries of such programs.[7] Moreover, we expected to find the attitudes of Blacks and White women regarding the effectiveness and value of affirmative action to be significantly different.

Research Hypothesis 4: Discussion

Our fourth research hypothesis suggests that well educated Whites in comparison to poorly educated Whites, will be more supportive of affirmative action when presented with abstract questions. However, we hypothesized that only minor differences would exist between well and poorly educated Whites when more specific applications of affirmative action were presented to them in a question.

At the outset, it should be noted that this hypothesis contradicts classic studies on democratic and racial tolerance. For example, Prothro and Grigg's study (1960) of citizens' attitudes toward democratic principles and racial tolerance in Ann Arbor and Tallahassee found that the largest differences of opinion were registered in the high education-low education dichotomy, and that the most tolerant or democratic responses were registered in the high education group. Based on this finding, Prothro and Griggs suggest that attitudes toward racial equality and democratic principles are "not a function of class... but of greater acquaintance with the logical implications of broad democratic principles" (Prothro and Grigg, 1960:291). Similarly, Converse (1964) and Greeley and Sheatsley (1974) suggest that well educated persons are more racially liberal and tolerant than are less educated citizens.

Our fourth research hypothesis rejects these earlier arguments. In part, this hypothesis is derived from the work of Mary Jackman (1978). Using data from the 1964, 1968, and 1972 presidential election surveys, Jackman constructed abstract and applied indices of racial tolerance. Jackman clearly rejects the views of Prothro and Grigg when she posits that increased education does not contribute to greater racial tolerance in applied settings. Although Jackman did find that support for the abstract principle of racial integration, increased with education, education did not increase support for specific policies promoting greater racial integration between Blacks and Whites. This relationship between increased education and applied racial tolerance held constant in the period 1964 to 1972. Hence, Jackman concludes that: "education produces more support for the relatively abstract principle of racial integration, but has no effect on support for government action to promote integration, and only negligible influence on support for school busing" (Jackman, 1978:315)[8]

The relationship between education and racial tolerance/racial policy has also been recently examined by Sniderman, Brody, and Kuklinski (1984). Using survey data from the 1972 and 1976 National Election Studies, the authors suggest that "policy preferences are grounded in principle in the case of race" (1984:90). They conclude that concrete support for

abstract positions is usually forthcoming, since that support is based upon principle.

The Sniderman, Brody, and Kuklinski (1984) findings were, however, somewhat paradoxical. Logically, one would expect that the relationship between principle and policy would be strongest among respondents with higher education. However, Sniderman, et al. found that when the relationship between principle and policy are examined, "it is as strong among the least educated" (1984:90). The authors suggest that the influence of education on racial attitudes is influenced by affective and cognitive linkages. At the risk of oversimplification, the authors suggest that support or opposition to a racial policy by the poorly educated is determined by the degree to which an individual "likes" a group. Finally, the authors posit that complexity in the cognitive systems of the well educated encourages extremely well differentiated idea systems. The complexity and differentiation in the idea systems of the well educated act to preclude any single principle from totally dominating the beliefs of this group. Hence, racial equality is ONE principle among the MANY held by the well educated.

Our fourth research hypothesis was most strongly influenced by Jackman (1984). Although we believed that well educated Whites would advance more liberal attitudes on affirmative action than would poorly educated Whites, we did not expect to

find significant differences between the two groups when they were asked to support concrete racial policies. Whites could be expected to support affirmative action in the abstract because they have been socialized to give the socially "correct" responses. However, we believed that well educated Whites would not be especially supportive of affirmative action policies because they would view well educated Blacks as both competitors and as beneficiaries of affirmative action. Stated more bluntly, well educated Whites would oppose affirmative action because it might cost them their jobs.

METHODOLOGY

Our telephone survey of 648 respondents living in the Washington, D.C. area was conducted between March 1, 1982 and March 15, 1982. Telephone numbers were picked at random from published telephone directories. In order to sample unlisted and new telephone numbers, we added "one" to the last digit of existing numbers. Within each household, we selected from among those over the age of 18 years by using standard randomization grids. We purposely overrepresented respondents living in Washington, D.C. in order to have a sufficient number of inner city and Black respondents for analysis (41.3% of the entire sample lived in Washington, D.C.). The remaining respondents lived in Montgomery or Prince George's County, Maryland or in the Virginia counties of Arlington, Fairfax, or Alexandria. Our

suburban sample was chosen in proportion to 1980 census estimates of the population. Our interviewers were students in the Department of Political Science at Howard University who were enrolled in our methodology courses.

We sought to measure attitudes on the quality of life and the extent of discrimination confronting Blacks and women by asking questions in five areas. These questions measured individual attitudes on: (1) whether the quality of life for Blacks is improving or declining; (2) whether racial and sexual discrimination continues to be a problem for Blacks and women; (3) whether racial discrimination in education, employment, and housing is a problem in the area where the respondent resided; (4) the extent of racial and sexual discrimination where the respondent worked; and (5) whether the respondent had ever personally experienced discrimination.

Our statistical analyses were concentrated around the hypotheses previously discussed. However, we decided to conduct additional exploratory work around demographic correlates with affirmative action attitudes. We crosstabulated these attitudes with race, sex, age, education, employment status, occupation, labor union membership, perceived chances of promotion, marital status, voter registration status, how the respondent voted in the 1980 presidential election, self-placement on a liberal-conservative scale, self-designation of class, the number of

employees at the respondent's job, the percentage of employees at the job who are White or female, religion, frequency of church attendance, whether the respondent has children, and where the respondent lives. If these crosstabulations were statistically significant ($p < .05$), they are reported in the tables and briefly mentioned in the analysis. It is hoped that these exploratory findings will suggest additional hypotheses to be investigated.

IMPROVEMENT OF CONDITIONS

On balance most respondents perceived that current conditions had improved for Blacks compared to ten years ago (see Table 1). Although most Whites were likely to hold this perception (88.3%), a significant proportion of Blacks (69.7%) also perceived improvement. There was, however, some variation in the attitudes of different demographic groups. For example, older and less educated Whites were significantly more likely than were all other demographic groups to perceive improving conditions for Blacks. We were somewhat surprised that there was no corresponding education or generation effect among Blacks, since previous studies have found that those Blacks who came of age in the 1960's and who are highly educated tend to perceive less improvement or a decline in the conditions of Blacks.[9] The only significant demographic effect among Blacks was that those Blacks employed in jobs where there were fewer

White co-workers were more likely than were other Blacks to perceive no change or a decline in the condition of Blacks. Finally, it should be noted that these findings are similar to those found in the ABC/ Washington Post poll of February 1981.

A sharp contrast was provided when respondents were questioned on changes in the quality of life for Blacks during the year preceding the survey (see Table 2). A majority of Blacks (65.6%) and a significant proportion of Whites (44.1%) perceived conditions for Blacks worsening over the previous year. Among Whites, less educated respondents were again more likely than were others to perceive the quality of life for Blacks improving. Not surprisingly, we also found that Whites voting for President Reagan in 1980 were more likely than were Whites voting for presidential candidates Carter or Anderson to perceive that the quality of life for Blacks had improved (44.3% vs. 23.6%). Perhaps the most interesting relationship was that those Whites claiming to have been discriminated against personally in the past were more likely to perceive conditions for Blacks worsening over the past year than were those not claiming to have been victims of discrimination (58.4% vs. 40.9%). Although it is not clear why this relationship existed, it is possible that those Whites perceiving personal discrimination in their own lives are more likely than are other Whites to empathize with other victims of discrimination.

Among Black respondents, we did not discover a significant variation for any of our demographic subgroups on this question. It appears that all major Black subgroups hold similar attitudes on the extent to which the quality of life for Blacks had deteriorated over the past year.

In summary, the section on "Improvement of Conditions" found all demographic groups supporting the notion that the relative status of Blacks had improved in the past ten years. There were, however, differences in the degree to which each major group supported this view. As we expected, Whites, and especially older and less educated Whites, were more likely than were others to perceive significant improvement in the conditions of Blacks. On the other hand, most Black respondents, regardless of their demographic profile, perceived that the quality of life for Blacks had deteriorated in the past year. These findings provide some support for Hypothesis 1 (Black/White attitude differences) and Hypothesis 4 (education and class differences on the attitudes of Whites).

DOES DISCRIMINATION CONTINUE AS A PROBLEM FOR BLACKS AND WOMEN

We sought to establish the extent to which discrimination in employment currently affects Blacks and women. We first asked whether racial discrimination continues as "a major problem facing Blacks on the job market?" We found that an over-

whelming percentage of Blacks (94.5%) and a significant majority of Whites (68.3%) perceived racial discrimination as a major problem for Blacks on the job market (see Table 3). The virtual unanimity in the Black response to this question precluded our making comparisons between subgroups of Blacks. However, there were significant variations among White subgroups. Those Whites who were self-designated as members of the upper or middle class, who were younger, were Carter or Anderson supporters, or who were more educated were more likely than were other Whites to agree that racial discrimination continues as a problem for Blacks in the labor market. The direction of these findings for each of the White subgroups listed above was repeated on several subsequent questions. On balance, Whites who are younger, more educated, more affluent, and are politically liberal often express greater empathy and support for positions favorable to Blacks and other minorities.

Since Blacks and women are potential competitors in reaping the so-called benefits of government and industry affirmative action programs, it might logically be assumed that members of each group would be less cognizant of the artificial barriers confronting the other. This assumption is based on our third research hypothesis which posited that White women would not support Blacks because to do so would work against their perceived group interest. Similarly, we assumed that Blacks would

not support affirmative action for White women, because White women have supposedly derived the most benefits from affirmative action. Throughout the survey, however, we found that Blacks (both men and women) were more sympathetic to women than were Whites generally. For example, Table 4 indicates that Blacks were significantly more likely to perceive sexual discrimination as a major problem confronting women in the labor market than were Whites generally (86.9% vs. 73.7%). Perhaps the most surprising "non-difference" was that men and women were equally likely to perceive sexual discrimination as a significant problem for women in the job market.

To a great extent, the findings in the section on "Discrimination as a Continuing Problem for Blacks and Women" support hypotheses 1 and 4, while rejecting some aspects of hypothesis 3. First, the abstract questions posed in this section found significant differences in attitudes between Blacks and Whites. Hypothesis 4 was supported when we discovered that well educated Whites were more likely than were less educated Whites to perceive discrimination as a continuing problem. We did not, however, uncover support for our third research hypothesis. We assumed that Blacks would not be more likely to perceive discrimination as a continuing problem for White women, because of the relative success enjoyed by White women under affirmative action. We were surprised to find, however, that

Blacks are significantly more likely than are Whites generally to perceive sexual discrimination as a continuing problem. We believe Blacks are more likely to perceive sexual discrimination as a continuing problem for White women because of the continuation of their own racially based discrimination.

DISCRIMINATION IN EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

We sought to determine the extent to which respondents considered discrimination a local concern by asking whether "in the town in which you live would you say that Blacks and other minorities are discriminated against a lot, some, or not at all in: education, employment, and housing?" There were, as might be expected, large differences in the perceptions held by Blacks and Whites. In addition, we uncovered significant differences of opinion within racial groups and between the various demographic subgroups.

There were clear differences between Blacks and Whites about the extent to which there was discrimination in education (see Table 5). Among Whites, 65.3% perceived no discrimination in this area, compared to 17.2% of Blacks. We found Whites were less likely than were others to perceive discrimination in education if they were older, frequent churchgoers, residents of Prince George's County, less educated, parents of children, and Reagan supporters.

There was also some variation in the degree to which different groups of Blacks perceived this problem. For example, (self-identified) working and lower class Blacks were significantly more likely than were middle and upper class Blacks to posit that there was a lot of discrimination in education (39.1% vs. 23.8%). Conversely, middle and upper class Blacks were almost twice as likely as were working or lower class Blacks to state that discrimination was not a problem in local education (23.8% vs. 12.2%). Given this finding, we were not surprised to discover that less educated Blacks were also more likely to perceive discrimination in education as a problem. We found that 40.2% of Blacks with only a high school education perceived a lot of discrimination, while only 26.5% of those with a college education, and 25.0% of those with a graduate school education held similar perceptions. Finally, we discovered that Blacks who had not been personally discriminated against were more likely than were other Blacks to perceive that there was either a lot of discrimination in education or none at all. We have no explanation for this contradictory finding.

On balance, the survey's results on perceptions of discrimination in education locally were consistent with what we expected. The Whites who said they did not perceive discrimination in education were more politically conservative (Reagan supporters) or from groups with lower socio-economic status

(less education). Moreover, the Whites not perceiving discrimination in education came of age during a more conservative period (older Whites), or were more likely to be threatened by Black claims for a more equitable educational system (Whites with children). Furthermore, we found that Whites in Prince George's County were more likely than were White residents of other counties to harbor antagonistic attitudes on racial issues.

Our findings were also consistent with what one would expect among Blacks. Those Blacks with lower socio-economic status have neither the monetary resources nor the political power to improve significantly the education received by their children. As a result, these groups logically perceive themselves to be victimized by discrimination in education.

We found that Whites were more likely to perceive discrimination in hiring (56.3%), than they were to perceive discrimination in education (34.7%) (see Table 6). Nonetheless, White respondents were still significantly less likely to perceive discrimination in hiring than were Blacks (56.3% vs. 92.6%). White respondents were less likely than were others to perceive discrimination in hiring if they worked at jobs with a lower percentage of women, were over the age of 40, were less educated, frequently attended church, were parents, voted for Reagan in 1980, or resided in Prince George's County. With the excep-

tion of the percentage of women in the workplace, the direction for all of these demographic findings is similar to the direction found with regard to discrimination in education.

In interpreting the finding that Whites perceived greater discrimination in hirings than in education, we hypothesize that this is due to their greater personal awareness of employment practices; i.e., the number of Whites who are employed is larger than the number who go to school. Given this awareness, Whites may hold greater empathy for the hiring discrimination Blacks face. We also hypothesize that Whites who work with a higher percentage of women are more likely than are others to be aware of the hiring problems of Blacks due to their close contact with a sexual group which also experiences significant hiring discrimination.

There was virtual unanimity among Black respondents that discrimination in hiring was a concern. The only demographic variable affecting the responses of Blacks was labor union membership. We found that Blacks who were labor union members were significantly more likely than were non-labor union members to perceive "a lot" of discrimination in hiring (70.3% vs. 43.0%). Possibly the perceptions of union members reflects problems of discrimination they encounter at the workplace, and within their unions. Another possibility is that some labor unions have conducted educational programs about discrimination at the worksite

- thus increasing awareness of this problem. Finally, it is important to note that Blacks identified discrimination in hiring as the area with the highest degree of discrimination.

There were also significant differences in the perceptions held by Blacks and Whites on discrimination in housing (see Table 7). Whites were significantly more likely than were Blacks not to perceive any discrimination in housing (56.0% vs. 12.0%). This represents over a four-fold difference. Again, we found that Whites were less likely than were others to perceive discrimination in housing if they were over 40, were less educated, were residents of Prince George's County, were Reagan supporters, and were parents of children. In addition, Whites who were blue-collar workers or who were married, widowed, or divorced were also less likely than were others to perceive discrimination in housing. We hypothesize that the attitudes of these demographic groups (for example, White blue-collar workers), likely reflect the threat of competition Blacks pose to these respondents. In other words, many of these groups are likely to be competing with Blacks for choice and/or inexpensive housing. Accordingly, their attitudes reflect a concern for access to housing, or alternatively, a concern for property values.

Although Blacks were virtually unanimous in perceiving housing discrimination as a problem (88.0% perceive "a lot" or

"some" discrimination), there were significant differences in the perceptions held by Blacks from different economic groups. For example, one-third of Blacks with incomes above \$40,000 did not perceive discrimination in housing in their area. This figure is in contrast to that for Blacks with incomes below \$40,000, less than 10% of whom stated that there was no housing discrimination. Moreover, almost one-half of Blacks with incomes below \$40,000 perceived "a lot" of housing discrimination, while only one-eighth of Blacks with incomes above \$40,000 held this perception. Possibly, the differing perceptions of these two groups of Blacks reflect their different experiences in the housing market. Blacks with incomes below \$40,000 are more likely than are others to be consigned to inferior housing due to their race and income. By way of contrast, Blacks with incomes above \$40,000, residing in the relatively liberal Washington, D.C. area, might encounter less difficulty in finding suitable housing primarily due to their income.[10] Given their higher income, wealthier Blacks might find it easier to secure satisfactory housing than poorer Blacks.

Our first research hypothesis was supported when we found that Blacks were significantly more likely than were Whites to perceive discrimination as a continuing local problem in education, employment, and housing (see Tables 5-7). Our second research hypothesis on class differences among Blacks was sup-

ported by the findings on discrimination in education and housing. Finally, our fourth research hypothesis was supported by our findings. Hence, less educated Whites were significantly less likely than were well educated Whites to perceive discrimination in education, employment, and housing for Blacks.

DISCRIMINATION AT THE WORKPLACE: RACE

We attempted to determine the extent to which racial discrimination was perceived as a problem at the workplace by asking respondents a series of questions on how race affected hiring, supervisory positions, promotions, and salaries. In posing these questions, we were particularly concerned with examining how the subjective perceptions of Blacks and Whites differed. Given the nation's history of racial discrimination in employment, we hypothesized that Blacks would evince higher subjective perceptions of discrimination against Blacks at the workplace than would Whites. Although some of the more obvious types of racial discrimination in employment have disappeared, we felt that many Blacks would perceive their lower salaries and job status as a reflection of the continuing influence of more subtle racially-based discrimination.

Our second major research concern was to determine how the attitudes of different demographic groups within each race were affected by racial discrimination at the workplace. We were particularly concerned with whether there were significant atti-

tudinal differences between Blacks from different economic classes. As noted previously, Wilson (1980) suggests there are emerging differences in the labor experiences and life chances of Blacks from different economic classes. Wilson has suggested these differing experiences and life chances reflect differences in the education and training of upper and middle class Blacks versus lower and working class Blacks.

It is logical, given Wilson's theory, to hypothesize that the employment-related attitudes of Blacks from different economic categories are beginning to polarize. Implicit within the Wilson position is the notion that class is exerting a stronger influence than is race over the perceptions of Blacks regarding racial discrimination. Given this implicit assumption, we further hypothesized that the attitudes of upper-income Blacks would be closer to the attitudes of Whites with similarly high incomes than they would be to the attitudes of poor Blacks.

We asked respondents the following question: "At your workplace, of the following categories, is there a lot of racial discrimination against Blacks and other minorities, a little, or none at all in: hiring, promotions, salaries, and supervisory positions?" Although the least discrimination at the workplace was found for hiring, there were significant interracial and intraracial differences. Over three-quarters of all Whites (76.0%), but less than one-half of all Blacks (49.3%), reported

no racial discrimination in hiring at the workplace (see Table 8). Among Whites, Reagan supporters in the 1980 presidential election were significantly more likely to posit that there was no racial discrimination in hiring (82.4%) than were either Carter (72.1%) or Anderson (57.5%) voters.

Although these racial and demographic differences are relatively large, they were to be expected. We expected fewer Whites than Blacks to perceive racial discrimination because Whites experience little discrimination that is based on race. Hence, Whites are not personally cognizant of how discrimination impacts the lives of many Blacks. Moreover, antagonism, conflict, and competition at the workplace between the two races might preclude acknowledgement of racial discrimination in employment by Whites.

We were both surprised and perplexed by the contradictions, and the size of the differences found among Black subgroups on the issue of racial discrimination in hiring. For example, slightly less than one-fifth of Blacks with incomes under \$20,000 (18.3%) and those with incomes between \$20,000 and \$40,000 (18.8%), posited that there was a lot of discrimination in hiring at their workplace. However, no Blacks with incomes above \$40,000 agreed with this position. Moreover, the percentage of Blacks with incomes above \$40,000 stating there was no discrimination in hiring (75.0%) was almost equal to the percentage of Whites holding the same opinion (76.0%).

Based on our hypothesis, we expected to find some polarization in the attitudes of Blacks from different income groups. However, as noted above, we found that NO Blacks with incomes above \$40,000 perceived a lot of racial discrimination in hiring at their workplace. Quite possibly with regard to hiring, race does not wield the same influence for Blacks with incomes above \$40,000 due to their training and education as it does for lower income Blacks who lack similar education and training. Or to paraphrase Wilson (1980), race is not as potent an influence for "talented and educated" Blacks as it is for less affluent subgroupings. Regardless of the reason, race was not a good predictor of the attitudes of high income Black respondents toward racial discrimination in hiring.

There were, however, some contradictory findings. Blacks with incomes below \$20,000 and those with incomes above \$40,000 were more likely to state there was no discrimination in hiring than were those with incomes between \$20,000 and \$40,000. In essence, low income Blacks perceived less discrimination than did middle income Blacks. Another contradictory finding was that there were no corresponding differences among Blacks across the variables of education, occupation, or self-designation of class. Furthermore, this income effect was not present in our other three questions which measured racial discrimination at the workplace.

There were additional variations in the attitudes of other Black demographic groups. Black women were more likely than were Black men to posit that there was either a lot of discrimination in hiring or none. The finding that Black women were more likely to perceive a lot of discrimination was surprising because we later found that Black women perceived less personal racial discrimination than did Black men. Moreover, we found that those stating there was no discrimination in hiring at the workplace were more likely to work at a place with a larger number of Blacks or to state that they had not personally experienced racial discrimination.

We did not discover variations among different groups of Whites on whether there was discrimination in promotions at the workplace (see Table 9). However, we did find that only 6.5% of Whites and 23.8% of Blacks stated there was a lot of discrimination in promotions. Moreover, a relatively large number of Whites (73.8%) stated there was no discrimination in promotions, while a significantly smaller percentage of Blacks (39.5%) held this view. Among Black respondents, women, those working at firms with a higher proportion of Whites, and those who had personally experienced discrimination in the past were more likely than were other Blacks to say that there was a lot of racial discrimination in promotions at the workplace.

Basically similar patterns emerged when respondents were asked to estimate the extent of discrimination in salaries at the workplace (see Table 10). First, there were no significant differences in the subjective attitudes among White subgroups. However, there were some fairly large differences between the attitudes of Blacks and Whites. For example, less than one-half of Blacks saw no discrimination in salaries compared to over 80% of Whites. Among Blacks, those who had been discriminated against in the past and those working with a higher proportion of Whites were again more likely to state there was a lot of discrimination in salaries.

One important non-finding was that there were no significant differences between White males and White females on questions related to racial discrimination in hirings, promotions, and salaries at the workplace.

Our last question on racial discrimination at the workplace sought to determine the perceptions of Blacks and Whites on discrimination in supervisory positions (see Table 11). On balance, the differences between Blacks and Whites on this question were similar to those found for the previous questions. However, there were significant differences among White subgroups. For example, Whites were more likely to say there was no racial discrimination if they were employed by the federal government, were female, worked at a place where fewer than 60%

of the employees were Black, had children, resided in the suburbs, and voted for Reagan in 1980. The direction of these findings for White women is consistent with our research hypothesis on White women and Blacks. Although White women may personally encounter discrimination at the workplace when attempting to gain supervisory positions, it is not in their self-interest for them to be more aware of or empathetic toward any racial discrimination encountered by Blacks. As a result, White women were actually less aware of racial discrimination in this area than were White males. (71.9% vs. 66.7%). However, we did find White females slightly more likely to perceive a lot of discrimination in supervisory positions than were White males (14.1% vs. 8.9%).

Given our findings on previous questions, we were not surprised to find that among Whites, those most likely not to perceive racial discrimination in the filling of supervisory positions were Reagan supporters or resided in the suburbs. Throughout the survey we found these groups to hold some of the most conservative social attitudes. We also expected Whites in the federal government to perceive less discrimination due to the more widely publicized anti-discrimination posture of the federal government. Finally, we were not surprised that Whites claiming to have experienced discrimination were significantly more likely to perceive racial discrimination in filling super-

visory positions than were Whites who had not personally experienced discrimination.

There was, as predicted, a large percentage difference in the perceptions held by Blacks and Whites on the extent to which racial discrimination was a factor in filling supervisory positions. A significantly greater number of Whites, relative to Blacks, did not perceive racial discrimination in this area (69.2% vs. 40.4%). Among Blacks, those most likely to perceive discrimination in filling supervisory positions were women, those in workplaces where more than 60% of the employees were White, and those who had personally experienced discrimination.

In sum, we uncovered significant interracial differences when questions were posed on "Discrimination at the Workplace" in hiring, promotions, salaries, and placement. This finding is consistent with our first research hypothesis. Our second research hypothesis about class differences among Blacks was supported in the case of perceptions regarding discrimination in hiring. However, this hypothesis was not supported in the cases of perceptions regarding discrimination in promotions, salaries, and filling supervisory positions. The most interesting intraracial finding among Blacks was the different perceptions between Black males and Black females regarding employment discrimination. Black females were more likely to perceive discrimination in promotions and placement than were Black men.

Black males, by contrast, perceived greater discrimination in hiring. As we expected, White females were not significantly more likely than White males to perceive racial discrimination at the workplace. Finally, we did not uncover any significant class differences among Whites on these questions.

DISCRIMINATION AT THE WORKPLACE: SEX

We sought to determine the extent to which respondents perceived sexual discrimination as a problem at the workplace by posing questions on how gender affected hiring, filling supervisory positions, promotions, and salaries. These questions were posed to test two major hypotheses. First, we wished to determine whether Blacks considered sexual discrimination to be a myth. Since Blacks and White women are now supposedly in economic competition with one another as officially designated "disadvantaged classes," the two groups might be hostile to affirmative action efforts on behalf of the other. For example, in the previous section we found that White women were not significantly more likely to perceive racial discrimination at the workplace than White men. Second, we wanted to test for sex effects among Blacks and Whites. In particular, we wanted to examine whether the consciousness of males about sexual discrimination is significantly lower or higher than that of women.

On balance, we found Blacks more likely than Whites to perceive sexual discrimination at the workplace. For example, when

scores are averaged across all four questions, 69.6% of Whites said there was no sexual discrimination, and only 59.6% of Blacks held this position. By way of contrast, an average of 75.3% of Whites said there was no racial discrimination for the race questions, while only 44.6% of Blacks held this attitude. Although Blacks were less likely to perceive sexual discrimination than racial discrimination, they were still more likely to perceive sexual discrimination than were Whites. In sum, there were 10% more Whites saying there was no sexual discrimination, and 31% more Whites saying there was no racial discrimination. Clearly, Blacks are more likely than are Whites to perceive racial and sexual discrimination at the workplace.

Across all four questions, we found that Blacks and Whites who had been discriminated against in the past were more likely than were others to perceive discrimination against women at the workplace. For discrimination in hiring (see Table 12), we found that Whites were more likely not to perceive sexual discrimination if they resided in Washington, D.C. or Virginia, voted for Reagan in 1980, or had never personally experienced discrimination. There were two important sex effects for this question. First, there was no difference between White men and White women regarding attitudes on sex-based discrimination in hiring. Second, Black men were the subgroup least likely to state there was no sex-based hiring discrimination. It is like-

ly that Black men hold this attitude because of the race-related hiring discrimination they encounter. For example, we will later note that Black men were the subgroup reporting the greatest amount of discrimination in hiring. However, we also found that Black men were less likely than were Black women to say that there was a lot of sexual discrimination in hiring. In essence, Black women were more likely than Black men to say there was either a lot of sexual discrimination in hiring or none. We also found that Blacks working in firms with more than 100 employees were also more likely to perceive sexual discrimination in hiring.

Among White respondents, there was less recognition of sexual discrimination in promotions for those who resided in Prince George's County, had children, and who voted for Reagan in 1980 (see Table 13). Again, we did not find any differences between White men and women. However, Black men were once again the subgroup least likely to state there was no discrimination in promotions for women. Similar to the previous question on hiring, Black women were more likely to say either that there was a lot of discrimination or none. Among Blacks, there was a complex relationship when attitudes were broken down according to income. Black respondents earning under \$20,000 per year or over \$40,000 per year were more likely to state there was no discrimination, compared to those with incomes between \$20,000

and \$40,000. This curvilinear pattern duplicates our finding for the earlier question on racial discrimination in hiring at the workplace. We are not sure why this pattern reemerged in this question on sexual discrimination in promotions. We also found that Blacks with incomes above \$40,000 were the only subgroup not to have at least some of its members perceive a lot of sexual discrimination in promotions. Again, this repeats the pattern from the question on racial discrimination on hiring. Our final relationship was that those Blacks who felt their chances of promotions were excellent were less likely than were others to perceive sexual discrimination in promotions.

The only question that elicited any major differences between White men and women vis-a-vis the extent of sexual discrimination in the workplace was the one regarding discrimination in salaries (see Table 14). White men were more likely than White women to say there was no sexual discrimination in salaries (76.2% vs. 64.9%). Nonetheless, this difference was not statistically significant ($p=.08$). The other significant differences among Whites was that those born in Washington, D.C. (93.0%) and those who had not been discriminated against (73.2%) were significantly more likely to state there was no sexual discrimination in salaries than were those born elsewhere (66.4%) and those who had been discriminated against (64.5%).

We did not find the complex sexual effect occurring among Blacks that we saw in responses to the previous question. Moreover, this was the first question where Black women perceived sexual discrimination as more of a problem than did Black men. This question did elicit, however, the same complex income effect. Those with either very high or very low incomes stated that sexual discrimination was not a problem. However no Blacks with high incomes (i.e., over \$40,000 per year) perceived a lot of sexual discrimination in salaries. In addition, we found Blacks more likely not to perceive sexual discrimination in salaries if they belonged to labor unions, felt their chances for promotion to be excellent, were in blue collar or service occupations, or worked with a lower proportion of Whites at work.

The final question pertained to the extent of sexual discrimination at the workplace in supervisory positions (see Table 15). We found that Whites were more likely not to perceive sexual discrimination in this area if they worked where there were fewer than 100 employees or if they had never been discriminated against. Similarly, Blacks were also more likely not to perceive sexual discrimination in this area if they had never been discriminated against. As with the other questions, however, Blacks were more likely to perceive sexual discrimination in filling supervisory positions than were Whites.

The findings in the section on "Discrimination at the Workplace: Sex" are complex and require reasoned consideration. Blacks were more likely to perceive sexual discrimination as a problem at the workplace than were Whites. This finding is consistent with our first research hypothesis. However, this finding can be viewed as a contradiction of our second research hypothesis. The second research hypothesis assumes that Blacks will be less likely than will others to perceive sexual discrimination as a problem at the workplace, since Blacks and White women are competing for employment. Since our findings indicate that Blacks were more likely to perceive sexual discrimination than were Whites, the hypothesis is not supported. We did find some surprising support for our third hypothesis. Blacks were more likely than were White women to perceive sexual discrimination at the workplace in all areas except salaries. We believe this finding reflects the greater experience Blacks have developed in contending with discrimination. Finally, we did not uncover any significant class or status differences in the intraracial attitudes of Whites.

EXTENT OF PERSONAL DISCRIMINATION

Individual perceptions concerning the extent of personal discrimination were established by asking respondents, "At any place where you have worked, have you personally ever been discriminated against because of your race or sex?" For the entire

sample, 27.6% of the respondents indicated they had experienced discrimination. There was, however, significant variation among our four subgroups when the data were examined along racial and sexual lines (see Table 16).

Perceptions of discrimination were most pronounced among Black males. Almost one-half of Black males (49.4%) said they had experienced discrimination. Moreover, an overwhelming percentage of all Blacks experiencing discrimination perceived the discrimination as racially based (46.8%). By way of contrast, White males were the subgroup holding the lowest perception of personal discrimination (12.4%). This low perception of discrimination on the part of White males tends to belie the notion that White males perceive "reverse discrimination" as a significant problem.

Although no significant differences were found between the percentage of Black and White women encountering discrimination, (30.1% vs. 28.4%), there were notable differences in the type of discrimination each group experienced. Black women were more likely to identify race as the basis for the discrimination they encountered (17.1% race vs. 4.1% sex). This sharply contrasts with White women who were significantly more likely to perceive sex as the basis for discrimination (21.8% sex vs. 2.7% race). It is also important to note that a fair number of Black women felt victimized by both racial and sexual discrimination (9.8%).

Table 16 also indicates there were significant differences when Blacks and Whites were asked where they had experienced discrimination. For example, among Blacks experiencing discrimination, an overwhelming majority of the Black males (43.2%) and Black females (45.7%) said they had experienced discrimination at their present job. In surprising contrast, a relatively low percentage of White women experiencing discrimination said they had experienced discrimination on their present job (18.7%). One possible explanation for these findings is that Black and White women may have relatively greater mobility in the job market than do Black males. For example, Table 17 indicates Black males perceived greater discrimination against themselves in hiring than did either Black females or White females. In essence, White women experience relatively greater mobility.

Since women have "traditionally" had "access" to low-level clerical positions, they may discover it easier to make upward, downward, or lateral moves in the labor market, compared to Black males. Given this traditional access, White and Black women did not perceive hiring to be as great a problem as did Black males. Hence, Black males, a subgroup which has historically encountered discrimination in hiring, and which increasingly finds its skills outmoded due to technological changes, perceives hiring discrimination to be a greater concern than do other subgroups.

Added credence for this interpretation is provided in Table 18. The table indicates Black males were the subgroup least likely to quit their job as a response to perceived discrimination. By way of contrast, White males were the subgroup most likely to quit their jobs when encountering perceived discrimination. Presumably Black males felt there would be greater difficulty in getting new jobs than did their White counterparts. These subjective attitudes apparently reflect the different hiring experiences of the two groups of men.

The perceived nature of discrimination was also different across all four subgroups. Table 17 indicates that while the most frequent form of discrimination for all four subgroups pertained to promotions, Black males felt particularly victimized by discrimination in hiring. The fact that so few Black women perceived hiring discrimination as a problem (5.3%) may be related, as noted previously, to the availability of clerical jobs. White females, on the other hand, perceived greater discrimination in salaries. This finding is in accord with our previous finding that the only intersexual difference among Whites on the extent of sexual discrimination at the workplace was on salaries. Quite possibly, salary discrimination is perceived as a significant problem, due to the greater education of White women in general, and some specific groupings of White women in particular. Given their level of education, some par-

ticular groupings of White women may reasonably expect to receive salaries comparable to those of White males. In essence, the data supports the concern that many women's groups have over the need for equal pay for jobs of comparable worth. This is certainly a concern held by many women in the job market. In sum, Table 17 suggests Black males experience greater difficulty getting a job, Blacks in general encounter the most difficulty receiving a promotion, and White women perceive greater discrimination in salaries.

Based on the figures in Table 18, it appears our respondents have little faith in the procedures established to handle employment discrimination complaints. For example, respondents were more likely to quit their job or do nothing instead of filing a complaint with their employer or the government when experiencing discrimination. For the sample as a whole, 20.0% quit their jobs when experiencing discrimination and 35.2% did nothing. Less than 25% of the total respondents actually complained and only 6.1% of the respondents filed a suit. Quite possibly, our respondents were reluctant to take some sort of action because so few of the complaints were favorably resolved. For example, only 16.3% of the respondents reported that the employment discrimination complaint was resolved in their favor. Black women reported the highest success rate (25.0%) of our four subgroups.[11]

Finally, we examined the extent of personal discrimination by asking respondents about the nature of the jobs they held. Table 19 indicates that White women were more likely to perceive discrimination (52.5%) if they worked for a firm with fewer than 20 employees. The group experiencing the highest degree of discrimination was Black professionals. The survey found that 60.0% of Black professionals felt discriminated against, compared to 19.0% of White professionals. Perhaps more interesting is the fact that 25.0% of Blacks in blue collar or service occupations said they had been discriminated against -- a much lower proportion than their professional counterparts. Not surprisingly, the survey found that Blacks perceiving personal discrimination had higher education levels than did Blacks not complaining of employment discrimination. In addition, Blacks who felt they had been discriminated against were more likely to work for firms that primarily employed Whites. This final variable was particularly important for Black women.

The section on "Personal Discrimination" largely confirms our first research hypothesis. In general, Black females and Black males are more likely to have experienced discrimination than Whites in general, and particularly White males. Both Black females and Black males were more likely to have experienced discrimination on their current jobs. In addition, each group viewed race, and not sex, as the reason for this discrimi-

nation. White females also perceived discrimination. However, they were more likely to perceive this discrimination as based upon sex. In addition, they also tended to believe that discrimination had the greatest effect on their salary level. Not surprisingly, White males were the group least likely to have experienced discrimination based on race or sex.

ATTITUDES TOWARD AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

We asked respondents a series of questions on affirmative action programs to determine their level of support for these measures. Previous researchers (Jackman, 1978) have found White respondents more supportive of these programs when questions are phrased abstractly. To test this finding, our questions varied in terms of their specificity (specificity referring to the likely outcome of a program), and concreteness (concreteness referring to the policy measures to be implemented). For example, our most abstractly worded question asked respondents to agree or disagree (strongly or somewhat) that: "The government should see to it that people who have been discriminated against in the past get a better break in the future." Since this abstractly worded question does not refer to concrete mechanisms by which to remedy the effects of past discrimination, it is easier for groups that may be required to "pay" for any policy remedies to support the statement.

This abstractly worded statement on affirmative action elicited strong support from both Blacks (92.0%) and Whites (70.3%) (see Table 20). Those groups of White respondents more likely to agree with the statement included women (74.1%), Carter-Anderson voters (73.8%), and the middle or upper class (73.0%). It should be noted that even among those groups least supportive of the statement (the White working or lower class (63.1%), Reagan supporters (64.2%), and males (65.8%), a majority of these respondents still said they supported these governmental measures to remedy the effects of past discrimination. Again, we would suggest that this relatively high support reflects the fact that Whites can voice opposition to the widely acknowledged social evil of discrimination, without being questioned specifically on how to eliminate it.

Among Blacks, we discovered a similar sex effect, whereby males were less likely to support the statement than were females. However, the class effect was reversed from that which we found among Whites. Throughout the survey, we found that Blacks who self-designated themselves as lower or working class consistently articulated the most extreme attitudes. Given this pattern, we were not surprised to discover that the attitudes of working and lower class Blacks on our abstractly worded question were the second highest for any group (their score of 95.9% was surpassed only by the score of 96.0% for women). Finally,

Blacks in Northern Virginia extended relatively little support for this abstractly worded statement. This may be because residents of Northern Virginia suburbs are relatively wealthy and have a reputation for being politically conservative (i.e., a larger percentage of Northern Virginia voters than suburban Maryland voters cast ballots for Reagan in 1980).

Since women are potentially one of the main beneficiaries of affirmative action programs, the fact that they were significantly more supportive of these measures than were males was expected. Likewise, the finding that the effects of class were reversed for Blacks and Whites was consistent. We expected working class Whites not to support the programs because they presumably have the most to lose. Similarly, the support of the Black working class for affirmative action likely reflects the hope of this group that they might benefit from affirmative action.

In a question with slightly less abstract wording, we asked respondents if they approved or disapproved (strongly or somewhat) of programs where "some large corporations are required to practice what is called affirmative action for Blacks and other minorities. This sometimes requires employers to give special preferences to Blacks and other minorities when hiring" (see Table 21). Although the question does not specify what types of "special preferences" are to be utilized, the question does

state that policy steps will be taken to remedy the effects of previous discriminatory employment practices. Hence, this statement is less abstract, and as a result, was expected to illicit a greater negative reaction than did the previous question.

Although there was a slight decline in the percentage of Whites approving this statement (69.2% vs. 70.3%), the 1.1% difference was insignificant. Possibly, this small decline reflects the fact that the statement does not provide explicit and concrete policy steps to be taken to remedy the effects of previous discrimination. Among White respondents, the only demographic relationships that we found were that those designating themselves as liberal or having voted for Carter or Anderson in 1980 were more likely to approve of this statement. Hence, it appears that support for the statement among Whites was tied to one's ideological position.

Surprisingly, we found a larger decline in the percentage of Blacks supporting this statement. The percentage of Blacks supporting this slightly less abstract statement declined 6.4%, compared to the previously discussed decline of 1.1% for Whites. Among Blacks, a liberal-conservative effect occurred that was similar to that found for Whites. In addition, Blacks with incomes above \$40,000 were more likely to support affirmative action action programs in large corporations than were other

Blacks (95.8% vs. 84.8%). As we shall see later, this income effect is reversed when support for affirmative action programs moves into other policy areas.

We repeated the previous question, but changed its focus by substituting the word "women" for "Blacks and minorities" (the order of these two questions was reversed in half of the surveys). In addition to attempting to uncover attitudes toward affirmative action for women, we wished to test the previously discussed proposition that Blacks, and especially Black males, might be more opposed to affirmative action for women because women are potential competitors in the job market. Again, we found that this proposition was not borne out by the attitudes of Blacks in general or by Black males in particular. In fact, we actually discovered greater support for affirmative action for women among Blacks than among Whites (85.6% vs. 69.4). (See Table 22). Moreover, we discovered no significant sex effect among either Blacks or Whites. However, we did find that the attitudes of Blacks were influenced by occupation. Black professionals were more likely to support this statement than were non-professionals (94.3% vs. 83.9%). Political self-designation also influenced the attitudes of both Blacks and Whites. Liberals and those voting for Carter or Anderson were more likely to support affirmative action for women than conservatives or Reagan supporters (See Table 22).

The last four questions on affirmative action were more concrete and specific. Two of the questions specified steps to be taken in implementing affirmative action programs (i.e., establishing job training programs or using quotas), while two discussed the possible negative effects of an affirmative action program (i.e., layoffs in order of reverse seniority and hiring unqualified workers). Given the specificity and concreteness of the questions we expected to find increased polarization in the attitudes of Blacks and Whites.

We first asked respondents if they agreed or disagreed (strongly or somewhat) that "Businesses should be required to set up special training programs for women, Blacks, and other minority groups" (see Table 23). As expected, there was a significant increase in the gap between Black and White attitudes (78.4% vs. 48.9%). This difference of roughly 30% is significantly larger than the average Black-White difference of 17.9% found for the initial three questions on affirmative action. We were not surprised to discover the greatest opposition to affirmative action coming from those groups who might face increased competition from such programs (labor union members and White males), political conservatives (Reagan supporters), or those who might be required to administer such programs (the self-employed). We were surprised that high-income Whites were more opposed to job training programs than were poor Whites (70.5% vs

84.2%), since poor Whites are the group that would presumably face the greatest economic threat from better trained Black workers. However, this finding is in accordance with our fourth hypothesis, which predicted that more advantaged Whites would not be as liberal on affirmative action as the questions became less abstract.

We also found a significant income and class effect among Blacks. Blacks who described themselves as members of the lower or working class (83.5%) or with incomes below \$20,000 (84.2%) were more likely to support job training programs than were Blacks who were middle or upper class (68.1%) or those with incomes above \$20,000 (70.5%). It is important to note here that the income effect for this question is the reverse of that found among Black respondents for the more abstract questions regarding affirmative action. Quite possibly, this reversal might reflect the fact that job training programs in general would appear to be more beneficial to lower or working class Blacks who earlier in the survey were found to be more likely to say there was hiring discrimination where they worked. On the other hand, the corporate affirmative action programs discussed in the earlier question might be viewed as primarily benefiting the Black middle and upper classes. However, this interpretation may be contradictory, as one of the abstract questions on which middle class Blacks took a positive attitude toward affir-

mative action specified the need for corporate affirmative action in hiring.

The greatest racial polarization occurred when we asked respondents to agree or disagree with the following statement: "Unless quotas are used, Blacks and other minorities just won't get a fair shake." We expected this question to evoke a particularly negative response from Whites, since many Whites view quotas as a means by which Blacks and other minorities will obtain jobs at the expense of Whites. We found that 75.7% of Blacks agreed with this statement, compared to only 39.5% of Whites (see Table 24). This difference of 36.2% between Blacks and Whites was the largest difference for any of the questions on attitudes toward affirmative action programs. Among Whites, women and Anderson supporters were the groups most likely to agree with this statement. In fact, Anderson supporters were more than twice as likely as Reagan supporters to agree with this statement (54.2% vs. 26.2%). We again found a relatively strong class effect among Black respondents. Those Blacks designating themselves as lower or working class were more likely to agree with the statement about quotas than were those placing themselves in the middle or upper classes. Moreover, the 20.4% difference between the Black lower or working class and the Black middle or upper class is larger than the average percentage difference found between the races in the initial

three affirmative action questions. In spite of these differences, we did not find significant attitudinal differences across education, occupation, or income strata.

We did not expect to find as large a gap in the attitudes of Blacks and Whites on the issue of layoffs (see Table 25). Although the use of non-seniority based layoffs as a tool for achieving policy goals is also emotional, the term is not as value laden as is the term quotas. First, the term layoffs is typically connected with the loss of jobs by workers in old-line manufacturing industries. However, Washington, D.C. is a White collar government employees' town where workers experience reductions-in-force (RIF's) instead of layoffs. Moreover, the protections extended federal workers by government personnel procedures likely provide government employees a greater sense of job security than workers in manufacturing industries enjoy. Accordingly, many workers in Washington, D.C. may not perceive the issue of layoffs as directly affecting their lives. Despite these caveats, we still expected to find a significant racial difference in attitudes regarding layoffs. Different methods of layoffs (or RIFs) do represent an easily understood and fairly concrete policy step to be used in promoting the goal of racial equality. Furthermore, we expected our respondents to be aware of this issue due to the publicity generated by recent court cases on job seniority and affirmative action. To establish our

respondents' positions on these issues, we asked the following question:

When layoffs occur in government and industry usually those hired last are laid off first. Some argue that this discriminates against Blacks and women since they were often hired last because of past discrimination. Others argue that still the only reasonable way to decide is seniority. Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly, that those hired last should be fired first when layoffs occur even if more Blacks and women are laid off first.

As we expected, Whites were more likely to agree with this statement than were Blacks (61.6% vs. 42.3%) (see Table 25). However, the interracial percentage difference of 19.3% was significantly smaller than that registered for the prior questions on quotas or training programs. Since the layoff question implies that White males would be experiencing higher layoffs as a result of changes in the seniority system, we were not surprised to discover that males and those at jobs with fewer women were more likely than were others to agree with this statement. Similarly, we also expected more conservative Reagan supporters to agree with the statement. However, we were surprised to find the income effect again reversed from what we expected. We found low income Whites less likely than were higher income Whites to support the seniority system over a layoff system which takes race and sex into account in order to minimize the impact of layoffs based on seniority alone. Since these less

affluent Whites would be in direct competition with Blacks, even minimal support of affirmative action among this group is surprising. The final interesting feature about White respondents was that there were no significant differences between labor union members and non-labor union members.

Among Blacks, men were more supportive of the seniority system than women were. We found that class and the occupation of Black respondents did not affect the response distribution. However, those who felt their chances of promotion were fair or poor were more supportive of the seniority system than were those who felt optimistic about their chances of promotion.

Our final question relating to affirmative action asked respondents if providing "special preferences to Blacks and other minorities will result in the hiring of unqualified individuals?" As expected, Blacks were much less likely to agree with this statement than Whites (33.3% vs. 47.7%). There were no significant differences among the Black subgroups (See Table 26). However, among Whites, males (52.9%) and those who had not gone to graduate school (51.6%) were more likely to agree with this statement than females (43.3%) or those who had gone to graduate school (36.8%).

Although busing is not directly related to the issue of affirmative action, there are some similarities between the two concerns. First, both affirmative action and busing are con-

cerned with steps that can be taken by the political system to counteract the effects of previous racially discriminatory policies. Second, both busing and affirmative action have had the effect of dividing Blacks and Whites. We asked respondents to agree or disagree (strongly or somewhat) with the statement that, "If there is no other way to achieve racial integration in the schools - busing of children should be used." There were clear differences between Black and White responses in the expected direction (60.8% vs. 43.3%) (see Table 27). Those Whites who were most opposed to busing were over the age of 60, had a high school education or less, were Reagan supporters, parents of children, or residents of the Washington, D.C. suburbs. We found that the effects of being over 60 and being a Reagan supporter were especially strong. We hypothesize that this reflects the lack of social contact between older Whites and Blacks, as well as the more conservative social values of older Whites and Reagan supporters. Not surprisingly, those Whites with children who might be affected by busing also opposed its use. Among Black respondents, the only significant demographic effect was that labor union members were less in favor of busing than were non-union members (65.1% vs. 51.2%).

In the section on "Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action," we examined attitudes toward the implementation of affirmative action programs. The questions in this section varied according

to specificity and concreteness. Our first research hypothesis was supported when Blacks were found to be significantly more likely to support implementation of affirmative action programs than were Whites. However, we found that the attitudes of Whites varied according to the concreteness and specificity of the questions being asked.

The responses to several questions also provided support for our second research hypothesis. For example, working class Blacks were significantly more likely to support training programs, quotas, and the provision of "special breaks" to victims of discrimination than were middle class or upper class Blacks. On the other hand, more advantaged Blacks supported requiring corporations to set up affirmative action programs.

Our third research hypothesis was, for the most part, not supported. White women were more likely than were White males to support affirmative action on almost all the questions. The support of White women, however, was nowhere near the level of support expressed by Black men and women.

Finally, our fourth research hypothesis was largely supported. As expected, the importance of education in shaping the attitudes of Whites declined as questions became more concrete. Like some members of the White working class, relatively advantaged Whites (highly educated and affluent) also perceived Blacks and affirmative action as personal threats. For example,

advantaged Whites were more likely to support the abstract notion that past victims of discrimination should get a break in the future. However, higher income Whites were more likely to support the use of layoffs based on seniority and to oppose the implementation of job training programs for minorities than were low income Whites.

WHO BENEFITS FROM AFFIRMATIVE ACTION?

We attempted to determine which subgroups were perceived to derive the major benefits from affirmative action programs by asking respondents: "Of the following groups, have they benefited a lot, some, or not at all from affirmative action: Blacks, Hispanics, Whites, Women?" Overall, we discovered that Blacks and women were perceived as the major beneficiaries of affirmative action. However, there were significant interracial and intraracial differences among the subgroups of respondents. The following tables and text examine some of these differences.

WHITES AS BENEFICIARIES OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Significant differences emerged among the various subgroups of Whites when we asked whether Whites benefited from affirmative action (see Table 28). Perhaps the most interesting differences were those related to income and class. We found that 13.2% of Whites with incomes below \$20,000 felt that Whites received "a lot" of benefits from affirmative action, while 7.2% of Whites with incomes above \$20,000 held that view. There are

two ways to interpret these figures. On the one hand, the 6.0% difference between these two subgroups is relatively small. However, these figures do indicate that lower income Whites were almost twice as likely as were higher income Whites to perceive affirmative actions benefits going to Whites. Equally significant is the fact that an overwhelming percentage of Whites with incomes below \$20,000 (76.4%) perceived "a lot or some" affirmative action benefits going to Whites. By way of contrast, less than one-half of Whites with incomes above \$20,000 held similar perceptions. In sum, the lower a White respondent's income, the more likely the respondent was to perceive benefits from affirmative action going to Whites.

Similar income and class related findings were discovered in our other demographic categories. For example, the White working class was significantly more likely to perceive Whites benefiting from affirmative action compared to the White middle class (71.7% vs. 52.9%). Likewise, White collar non-professionals (67.0%) and White blue collar workers (70.5%) were more likely to perceive Whites receiving such benefits, compared to Whites in professional (51.4%) or managerial (35.9%) positions. These patterns were repeated when Whites were analyzed according to their level of education. We also discovered that Whites born in the Washington, D.C. area or the South were more likely to perceive Whites benefiting from affirmative action, compared to Whites born elsewhere.

These survey results are interesting, since the popular literature posits that lower-income, less educated, Southern born, blue collar, and non-professional Whites form the group least likely to support affirmative action. In considering these findings, however, some important caveats should be borne in mind. First, we asked our respondents whether Whites, as a total population group, benefited from affirmative action. However, we did not question the respondents as to whether their particular class, ethnic, religious, or sexual group derived benefits from affirmative action. Possibly, low income and less educated Whites perceive these benefits flowing to particular demographic subgroups (for example, college educated women or men occupying professional positions) and not to their particular subgroup. Moreover, low income and less educated Whites may perceive benefits flowing to Whites as a whole, or even to their particular subgroup, and still oppose the program because it violates other, more cherished beliefs and norms. In other words, a group or some of its members can benefit from a program in a concrete sense, and still oppose that program in a more abstract sense.

Finally, one should not confuse the receipt of benefits with support for a program. It should be noted that the terms "benefits" and "supports" are separate and distinct in both a conceptual and definitional sense. Despite these caveats, how-

ever, we were still surprised to discover that low income and less educated Whites perceived Whites as receiving greater benefits from affirmative action programs than did higher income and more educated Whites.

Another interesting finding among our White respondents was that females were more likely than were males to perceive Whites as benefiting from affirmative action (64.7% vs. 47.2%). This finding, of course, was to be expected since White women have received tangible benefits from affirmative action programs. Our other finding was that among Whites, those employed at firms with less than 100 employees were also more apt to perceive Whites as benefiting from affirmative action, compared to Whites working at firms with larger numbers of people (60.8% vs. 44.3%). The last finding deserves further research.

We found that Blacks were significantly more likely than were Whites to perceive Whites receiving major ("a lot") benefits from affirmative action. For example, Blacks with a high school education or less, were over three times more likely as were similarly educated Whites (44.4% vs. 12.2%) to perceive Whites benefitting from affirmative action. Likewise, college trained Blacks were over three times more likely (23.8% vs. 7.6%), and Blacks with a graduate school education were over five times more likely (23.5% vs. 4.5%) than were similarly trained Whites to perceive Whites benefiting from affirmative

action. These findings suggest two interesting interpretations. First, the less education a White or Black person has, the more likely that person is to perceive Whites benefiting from affirmative action. Second, there are significant differences in how the two races perceive affirmative action and its impact on Whites. The size of these differences suggests that Blacks do not perceive affirmative action as a program which benefits only "minorities."

These research findings support our research hypotheses about the attitudes of Whites and Blacks. First, it demonstrates that there are significantly different perceptions on affirmative action held by Blacks and Whites. Second, they suggest that many Blacks perceive White women as the primary beneficiaries of affirmative action. However the income and class related differences we found among Whites somewhat contradicted our fourth hypothesis. Lower income Whites were almost twice as likely to perceive Whites as beneficiaries of affirmative action as were high income Whites. On the other hand, we predicted the liberalizing effect of higher class status among Whites would be true only with regard to the abstract affirmative action questions. The question of whether Whites benefit from affirmative action is far from abstract.

BLACKS AS BENEFICIARIES OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

We were surprised that relatively small differences emerged between Blacks and Whites on whether Blacks benefited from affirmative action (see Table 29). With the interesting exception of Blacks earning incomes over \$40,000 (87.5%), and Black Catholics (86.2%), over 90% of the members of all Black and White subgroups perceived Blacks benefiting from affirmative action. There were, however, some fairly large differences among White subgroups on the degree to which Blacks benefited. For example, Whites voting for Reagan in 1980 were more likely to perceive Blacks benefiting a lot, while those voting for Anderson were more likely not to see Blacks benefiting a lot from affirmative action. It is also worth noting that all of the Whites voting for Carter saw Blacks benefiting from affirmative action. When Whites were separated by their area of residence, there were also some interesting differences. White respondents not residing in Prince George's County saw Blacks receiving more benefits from affirmative action programs than did Whites residing in the County. This finding gains additional importance when it is examined in conjunction with our previous finding that White Prince George's County residents were less likely than were Whites residing in different locales to believe that Blacks encountered discrimination in education, employment, and housing.

The largest relative differences occurred among Black subgroups. Black males (36.8% vs. 18.4%) were twice as likely as Black females to perceive Blacks benefiting a lot from affirmative action. This finding is especially surprising since the survey also found that Black males were the subgroup claiming to have experienced the greatest amount of personal discrimination. Several related interpretations might possibly explain why this discrepancy has emerged. First, there is a possibility that the life experiences of Black males and females are different. For example, the survey also found that Black women are the only demographic subgroup claiming to have experienced significant amounts of both racial and sexual discrimination (9.8%). As double victims of discrimination, their work experiences may differ radically from those of other groups in the labor force. Second, national statistics indicate that Black women constitute one of the most poverty stricken subgroups in the country. Accordingly, Black women may perceive fewer benefits going to Blacks, because roughly two-thirds of the Black households below the poverty line are headed by Black women.

Third, there is a possibility that some Black males may hold perceptions on affirmative action that constitute a "false consciousness." These Black males may falsely perceive benefits flowing to Blacks because they have heard claims concerning the supposed benefits of such programs. Or perhaps either they, or

some individuals around them, have derived benefits from the programs.

Finally, it is possible that Black males, being the group claiming the greatest amount of discrimination against themselves, are more likely to see the tangible benefits of affirmative action; i.e., that such programs affect their own personal experiences with discrimination. This final explanation, however, is unlikely, given that Black males were less likely than were Black or White females to say their own personal complaint of discrimination had been favorably resolved.

There is support for some of these interpretations in Table 30. The data indicate that Black women were the subgroup least likely to perceive affirmative action program benefits going to the Black lower class. For example, Black males were almost three times more likely to state that affirmative action primarily benefited the Black lower class. Since, as previously noted, Black women are more likely to be poverty stricken, their lower perception of who may benefit from affirmative action programs may reflect the fact that poor Blacks are not benefiting directly from such programs. If this is the case, one would logically expect Black women not to perceive major program benefits flowing to the Black poor. If, in fact, some subgroups of Black males derive greater benefits from the program, they may "falsely" perceive how affirmative action affects other sub-

groups. We will return to which class of Blacks benefited from affirmative action shortly.

It is easier to interpret the differences in perception among Blacks on whether Blacks benefited from affirmative action when the Black respondents are examined according to education and income. Almost 6 out of 10 Blacks who went to graduate school perceived Blacks deriving major benefits from affirmative action. By way of contrast, less than one-quarter of Blacks with a college degree or some college training held similar perceptions. Moreover, roughly one-fifth of Blacks with no college training perceived Blacks receiving major benefits from affirmative action.

A somewhat similar, though not as pronounced, pattern emerged when Black respondents were examined according to income. Blacks with incomes above \$40,000 were over twice as likely to perceive Blacks deriving major benefits from the program, compared to Blacks with incomes below \$20,000 (41.7% vs. 16.5%). We believe higher income and more educated Blacks are more likely than are low income, less educated Black to advance this perception because they derive the greatest benefits from affirmative action programs.

WHICH CLASS OF BLACKS BENEFITED MOST
FROM AFFIRMATIVE ACTION?

When we asked Black and White respondents which class of Blacks benefited the most from affirmative action some interesting similarities emerged (see Table 30). The most frequent response among both Blacks and Whites (41.9% vs. 51.0%) was that the Black middle class derived the most benefits. Although a slightly higher percentage of Whites selected the Black middle class as the primary affirmative action beneficiaries, Blacks were slightly more likely than were Whites to select the upper class. Significantly, both races were least likely to perceive the Black lower class as receiving the most benefits from affirmative action. Among White respondents, Democrats were more likely to perceive middle class Blacks benefiting the most, while Republicans were slightly more likely to select the Black lower or upper class as groups benefiting from affirmative action.

WOMEN AS BENEFICIARIES OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

We were surprised that education was the only demographic factor that produced significant differences among White respondents on whether women benefitted from affirmative action (see Table 31). Roughly 95% of the Whites with more than a high school education perceived women receiving a lot or some benefits from affirmative action programs. This figure was slightly

higher than that found for Whites with a high school education or less (85.7%). Perhaps more significant than this slight difference, however, is the fact that such an overwhelming percentage of Whites perceived women as benefiting from such program.

There were more varied subgroup differences among Blacks. For example, Black non-Baptist Protestants were the religious subgroup most likely to perceive benefits from affirmative action going to women. In contrast, Black Catholics and Black atheists were the subgroups least likely to perceive women deriving benefits. When we separated Blacks according to political party, we found that Blacks, who considered themselves to be independents were more likely than were Black Democrats to perceive women receiving no gains under affirmative action. One especially interesting nonfinding for both Black and White respondents was that there were no differences between men and women on whether women had made gains from affirmative action programs.

HISPANICS AS BENEFICIARIES OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

We discovered that Hispanics were the subgroup which was perceived as receiving the fewest benefits from affirmative action. It is important to note, however, that the Washington, D.C. area has a relatively small Hispanic population. Among White respondents, those most likely to perceive Hispanics as receiving major benefits from affirmative action were residents

of Washington, D.C. or Northern Virginia, or those with some graduate training. Those White respondents who were least likely to perceive affirmative action benefits going to Hispanics were born in Washington, D.C. or Maryland, or had a high school education or less. Among Blacks, non-Baptist Protestants were the subgroup most likely to identify Hispanics as receiving benefits from affirmative action. The Black subgroups perceiving the fewest benefits from affirmative action going to Hispanics were Black Catholics. There were no significant differences between Black and White respondents on this question.

WHO OPPOSES AFFIRMATIVE ACTION?

We attempted to determine the extent to which different groups were perceived to have a reputation for opposing affirmative action by asking our respondents the following question: "Of the following groups, do you think they have opposed affirmative action a lot, a little, or not at all: corporations, labor unions, Whites in general, the Black middle class, and the wealthy." The survey found Blacks (59.8%) and Whites (45.9%) holding similar perceptions that the wealthy were the group most likely to oppose affirmative action programs "a lot." Blacks (10.6%) and Whites (10.9%) were also similar in perceiving the Black middle class as the group least likely to oppose affirmative action seriously.

Minor differences emerged when Blacks and Whites were questioned on the extent to which corporations and labor unions opposed affirmative action. Among Blacks (38.1%) and Whites (33.7%), slightly over one-third of the respondents perceived corporations opposing affirmative action a lot (see Table 33). There was, however, greater variation in the perceptions of different Black and White subgroups. For example, Blacks who were Catholics, atheists, or who had previously been discriminated against were more likely to perceive corporations opposing affirmative action. Among Whites, those with children were more likely than were other Whites to perceive corporations opposing affirmative action.

We found Blacks and Whites holding relatively similar perceptions about the extent to which labor unions opposed affirmative action (see Table 34). Slightly less than one-third of Blacks (28.3%) and Whites (29.1%) held this view. There were no significant variations in the perceptions of White subgroups on labor union opposition to affirmative action. We were somewhat surprised to discover that this lack of variation between White subgroups also held for those Whites belonging to labor unions.

Among Blacks, the age of the respondent did affect perception of labor union opposition to affirmative action. Those Blacks between 41-59 years were significantly less likely (10.3%) to perceive "a lot" of union opposition to affirmative

action than were those between 18-40 years (33.0%) and those over 60 (38.8%). It is possible that these relatively large differences in perceptions between the subgroups reflects the different social and political periods when these Black respondents came of age. Blacks in the 18-40 subgroup came of age during the turbulence and protest of the 1960's and 1970's. As a result of their socializing experiences during this era, surveys have fairly consistently noted that these younger Blacks tend to be more alienated from traditional institutions. Older Blacks in the above 60 category came of political awareness during a more tranquil period. However, their experiences with labor unions were largely negative experiences built around the practice of racial segregation in labor organizations. Accordingly, it is to be expected that these older individuals would not be supportive of organizations which excluded them while they were younger and were more likely to be active in the labor force.

We discovered, not surprisingly, that Blacks were significantly more likely than were Whites to say that Whites opposed affirmative action a lot (56.5% vs. 27.6%) (see Table 35). Among White respondents, those with no children or who voted for Carter or Anderson in 1980 were more likely to state that Whites opposed affirmative action a lot. It appears likely that the White Carter-Anderson voters are more politically and socially liberal than are Reagan voters.

The survey consistently found that lower income Blacks in comparison to other groups, expressed greater hostility to other groups and institutions. We have suggested that this hostility may reflect the failure of programs, such as affirmative action, to address the structural employment problems of poor Blacks. Given this interpretation, we were not surprised to discover that working or lower class Blacks were more likely to state Whites opposed affirmative action a lot (62.5%) than were more affluent Blacks (47.7%). The relatively large attitudinal differences between Blacks and Whites further support our research hypothesis regarding interracial opinions on who is perceived to oppose affirmative action the most.

As noted previously, both Blacks and Whites identified the wealthy as the group most opposed to affirmative action (see Table 36). Given their generally more liberal political philosophy, Whites who voted for Carter or Anderson, not surprisingly, were more likely than others to hold this view. White residents of Montgomery County also were more likely to support this view. Given that Montgomery County consists of relatively affluent residents, this may be surprising. On the other hand, Montgomery County has a reputation for being the most liberal suburb of Washington, D.C.

As noted previously, both Blacks and Whites perceived the Black middle class to be the group least opposed to affirmative

action (see Table 37). Interestingly, only 38.3% of Black respondents stated that the Black middle class did not oppose affirmative action, compared to 51.8% of White respondents. It was also interesting to note that the perceptions Whites held about the extent to which middle class Blacks opposed affirmative action was influenced by the percentage of Blacks at the workplace. On balance, Whites perceived greater opposition to affirmative action by the Black middle class if they worked with few Blacks or if they worked with a large number of Blacks. In addition, the categories of Whites perceiving some opposition to affirmative action by the Black middle class included those voting for Reagan, or residing in Prince George's County, Maryland.

The perceptions of Blacks were influenced more by class than any other factor. For example, those Blacks who had not gone to college were more likely than was any other demographic group to perceive the Black middle class as opposing affirmative action a lot or some (78.0%). Other Blacks holding similar perceptions about the Black middle class were those in labor unions (72.2%), those with incomes under \$20,000 (76.8%), and Catholics (75.9%). Although these differences between Black subgroups were not apparent across self-designations of class, it nonetheless appears that class related factors do influence the perceptions of Blacks concerning Black middle class support for or opposition to affirmative action.

Recently, social scientists have suggested that a widening economic gap between poor and middle class Blacks is contributing to political and social divisions in the Black community.[12] In order to gauge the extent to which these assertions were accurate, we asked respondents, "Would you say that Blacks who made it to the middle class tend to have great sympathy and concern for poorer Blacks, some sympathy and concern for poorer Blacks, or little sympathy and little concern for poorer Blacks?" Among White respondents, those most likely to say that middle class Blacks held no sympathy for poorer Blacks were those employed by state or local government (50.0%) or those over the age of 60 (53.3% vs. 27.7%) (see Table 38). There are no obvious explanations to account for the perceptions of these White subgroups. It is possible, however, that Whites working at the state and local levels of government are more closely associated with Blacks who deliver direct social services to poor Blacks. Among Whites over 60, it is likely that their perceptions were formed during a period when their social contact with Blacks was significantly different from and less honest than interracial social and job-related contact is now. Accordingly, their perceptions likely reflect the norms and values of that previous era. Other Whites perceiving little sympathy for poor Blacks on the part of middle class Blacks were in managerial or professional occupations, had not attended

graduate school, had children, and were residing in the suburbs. In essence, those Whites who were themselves most opposed to affirmative action were also more likely to perceive the Black middle class as being opposed to the same programs.

The perceptions held by Blacks on the amount of sympathy which the Black middle class had for poor Blacks was heavily influenced by class. Again, working or lower class Blacks expressed the greatest skepticism about the Black middle class. For example, working or lower class Blacks were significantly more likely (55.5%) than were upper or middle class Blacks (36.2%) to state the Black middle class had no sympathy for poor Blacks. When Black respondents were separated by their income, the subgroup differences continued in the same pattern. For example, Blacks earning under \$20,000 were more likely to perceive the Black middle class as having no sympathy for poorer Blacks (59.3%), than were Blacks earning between \$20,000-\$40,000 (37.5%), or those earning over \$40,000 (33.3%).

DISCUSSION: WHO OPPOSES AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

In sum, we found that Blacks perceive greater opposition to affirmative action than do Whites. We were surprised to discover, however, that there were relatively small percentage differences between Blacks and Whites who identified corporations and labor unions as opponents of affirmative action. Although more Blacks than Whites perceived opposition to these programs, (the

average percentage difference for the two measures was 2.6%), the size of the differences was relatively small. There was a larger percentage difference in the number of Blacks identifying the wealthy as a group likely to oppose affirmative action (a difference of 13.9%). However, both races were similar in that they did identify the wealthy as the group most likely to oppose affirmative action.

The findings were less ambiguous when we asked the two races whether affirmative action programs were opposed by Whites. Blacks were significantly more likely to perceive White opposition to these programs than were Whites. The group holding the most consistent and intense perceptions on affirmative action programs and its opponents and supporters was the Black poor. The Black poor, a group which was self-designated in the survey as working class or lower class, was consistently found to be the most alienated from other racial and economic subgroups as well as from major institutions. It is important to note that this sense of alienation by the Black poor went across racial and economic lines. For example, the Black poor was the subgroup most likely to state that affirmative action was opposed by the wealthy a lot, and the second most likely demographic subgroup (after those with less than a high school education) to perceive the Black middle class as opposing such programs. Moreover, the Black poor and Blacks with incomes under

\$20,000 were the two groups most likely to posit that the Black middle class had no sympathy for the Black poor.

These findings on who opposes affirmative action have greater meaning when they are examined in conjunction with our earlier findings on which groups are perceived to be benefiting from affirmative action. With the exception of Black atheists, Blacks with incomes below \$20,000 or with characteristics normally associated with the poor or working class (for example, a high school education or less) saw Blacks receiving fewer benefits from affirmative action than did any other Black or White social group. At the same time, poor Blacks were the group that was most likely to perceive Whites deriving benefits from affirmative action. Since our survey found that both Blacks and Whites perceive the fewest benefits from affirmative action going to the Black lower class, it appears that the relatively polarized perceptions of low-income Blacks concur with their perceptions on who benefits from these programs. In other words, the perceptions of the Black poor on who benefits and who opposes affirmative action are the most polarized, because it appears that they represent the group (at least according to the opinion of others) which is receiving the least benefit from affirmative action programs.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This paper began by discussing research on affirmative action conducted by earlier social scientists. In this discussion, we reexamine previous surveys and compare earlier research to our findings. In addition, we will summarize the findings on our four hypotheses.

Attitude Surveys On Affirmative Action

Racial attitudes of Whites can be ranked along a continuum. After many years, almost all Whites now at least nominally support the right of Blacks to equal legal (e.g., voting) and social (e.g., access to housing) rights. There is, however, less agreement when questions are posed on concrete measures to obtain these equal rights or equal conditions.

Lipset and Schneider (1978) found strong support among Whites for programs which would assist Blacks in acquiring the skills needed to compete in education and the labor market. However, according to these authors roughly 90% of Whites oppose programs which they perceive as granting Blacks preferential treatment over Whites.

Somewhat similar findings have been reported by Bolce and Gray (1978). In a 1977 random sample telephone survey of 600 New York City residents they found that 85% of Whites opposed granting "special advantages to Blacks over Whites in college entrance and job hiring in order to make up for the mis-

treatment they received in the past" Interestingly, a majority of Blacks included in that survey (53%) also said they opposed this concept of granting special advantages.

Equally strong negative attitudes have also been found in a study commissioned by the B'nai B'rith.[13] In an nationwide random sample telephone survey, 73% of the respondents said they opposed granting minority group members "special advantages" to rectify past discrimination. Similar to the findings of Bolce and Gray (1978), the B'nai B'rith survey found that 52% of nonWhites "said that companies should hire the most qualified applicants regardless of race or ethnic background and should not be required by law to hire a fixed percentage of members of minorities."

These findings stand in sharp contrast to those recently reported by Cardell Jacobson (1983). In an analysis of data from a national survey of 732 Blacks conducted by Louis Harris and Associates for the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Jacobson found strong and consistent support for affirmative action among Blacks. The average positive endorsement for affirmative action was 78.7% and the range was from 59.6% to 91.3%.

There are sharp differences in the findings of Bolce and Gray, B'nai B'rith, and Jacobson. There are several possible explanations for these differences. Bolce and Gray used a New

York City sample, while the other two surveys were national in scope. Moreover, the results of the B'nai B'rith survey were broken down according to White and nonWhite respondents, and it is not known how many of the nonWhites were in fact Black.

The wording and order of questions may also have influenced the results of prior surveys. Bolce and Gray (1978:64) began their question on preferential treatment by introducing the image of a hostile federal government: "There should be a law which gives special advantages to Blacks over Whites...." This negative feeling is exacerbated when the question states that Blacks will gain advantages over Whites. By way of contrast, the affirmative action questions asked by Jacobson were phrased in a relatively benign fashion. For example, a typical question from the Jacobson (1983:302) affirmative action scale states: "Unless quotas are used, Blacks and other minorities just won't get a fair shake."

Two additional important findings were reported by Jacobson (1983:307). He found only slight or non-existent relationships between the attitudes of Blacks and their socio-economic characteristics. He did find, however, that the attitudes of Blacks were related to experiential and attitudinal variables. Individuals who felt powerful, who believed that Black leaders were effective, and who felt in control of their destiny tended to support affirmative action. In addition, those individuals

who believed racial progress had been accomplished and were optimistic about the future progress of Blacks were also slightly more supportive of affirmative action than were others.

Klugel and Smith (1983) looked at factors influencing the attitudes of Whites toward affirmative action. Using data from a 1980 national survey of 1596 respondents, they tested three types of factors to determine which ones influence attitudes on affirmative action. These three categories were as follows: (1) Economic Self Interest; which is based on fears concerning their economic security; (2) Racial Effect; that is traditional racial prejudice and its more socially acceptable variant, symbolic racism; and (3) Stratification Beliefs; that is opposition because affirmative action offers a structuralist, rather than an individualist view of American society. Klugel and Smith conclude that all three factors make independent contributions to the attitudes of Whites toward affirmative action. Similar to the researchers in each of the previous studies, Klugel and Smith (1983) also found that support for affirmative action declined when programs sought equality of condition and output.

Hypothesis 1: Black and White Attitude Differences

Given our first research hypothesis, we expected that race would be one of the most important determinants of attitudes toward affirmative action. We reasoned that Blacks would strongly support affirmative action and that Whites would oppose

it. As noted above, this hypothesis contradicts, in part, some of the findings advanced by B'nai B'rith and by Bolce and Gray (1978). Although their surveys found more Blacks supporting affirmative action, they both suggest that a majority of Blacks and Whites oppose preferential treatment for Blacks. By way of contrast, Jacobson (1983) found significant interracial differences in these attitudes.

Our findings largely support those of Jacobson. Blacks were significantly more likely than were Whites to view racial discrimination as a continuing problem and to support affirmative action programs designed to alleviate this discrimination. In addition, Blacks were significantly more likely than were Whites to be cognizant of discrimination confronting women and to be in agreement with affirmative action programs for women. In fact, there were few instances where the attitudes of Blacks and Whites did not differ sharply.

Similar to the findings of previous surveys, this study found that Whites extended greater support for affirmative action when it did not propose structural equality of condition and outcomes, (i.e., Blacks and Whites both demonstrated less support for affirmative action when the proposed solutions move from simple self-help or equality of opportunity to preferential treatment for Blacks, other minorities, and women). This finding is consistent with that of previous studies. However, the

decline of support for structural affirmative action programs was far sharper among Whites than it was among Blacks. Moreover, our survey also found a majority of Blacks supporting these programs. These two findings contradict those of previous studies.

Hypothesis 2: Intraracial Attitude Differences Among Blacks

Our second research hypothesis stated that significant attitudinal differences would emerge between Blacks who are relatively secure economically, and those who are less advantaged. We reasoned that working class Blacks would not be as supportive of affirmative action because these programs did not address the fundamental causes of their poverty.

There was some limited support for this hypothesis in an ABC News/ Washington Post poll (Public Opinion, April/May 1981). However, very few prior surveys have included large samples of Blacks so as to be able to make valid intraracial comparisons. The one exception to this was the Jacobson (1983) who used Harris poll data. However, Jacobson did not find a significant amount of variance in the attitudes of Blacks.

Throughout the survey, we found, in contrast to Jacobson, that socio-economic status had a major influence on the attitudes of Blacks. Racism is, in general, seen as a greater concern among poor Blacks. However, Black professionals were more likely than were others to believe that discrimination personal-

ly affected their careers. Quite possibly, this perception reflects the greater interaction that Black professionals have with their White counterparts. Taken together, these two findings suggest that class influences how Blacks perceive racism impacting their lives.

It is also important to note that the Black working class consistently expressed some of the most extreme positions regarding affirmative action and the adverse effects of discrimination. They were much more likely than were Blacks from higher socio-economic positions to believe that Whites and the wealthy opposed affirmative action. In addition, working class Blacks were more likely to support training programs and quotas. However, although they were in greater support of these programs, working class Blacks did not believe that they had benefited from such programs and often felt that the Black middle class opposed the implementation of affirmative action programs.

We believe that the attitudes of Blacks are influenced by their status as a distinct racial group in White society. Although overt racism has declined, Klugel and Smith conclude that "White attitudes toward affirmative action reflect racial hostility" (1983:819). Similarly, McConohay, Hardee and Batts note that while old-fashioned racism has declined, "modern racism goes undetected or unacknowledged" (1981:788). Since race continues as a major factor in the lives of Blacks, it

encourages support for programs seeking to ease the impact of racial discrimination. This support is particularly strong among those who are most affected by this racism, namely the Black underclass. This point was supported when we found that respondents who had encountered discrimination were particularly strong supporters of affirmative action and were more sensitive to racial and sexual discrimination than were others.

There is complexity as well as some ambiguity in Black intraracial attitudes on affirmative action and discrimination. Clearly, the attitudes of Blacks on these subjects are affected by socio-economic factors. However, there is also evidence to suggest that the attitudes of Blacks are affected (to an equal or stronger degree) by the experience of being Black in a White society.

Hypothesis 3: Differences in the Attitudes of Blacks and White Females

Our third research hypothesis was that Blacks and White females will advance significantly different attitudes on affirmative action. This hypothesis was in contrast to the view that White women are generally more liberal than are White males and, in addition, are beneficiaries of affirmative action. We posited that Blacks support affirmative action for women with the expectation that their support will provide at least indirect benefits to Blacks. On the other hand, we note that many White

women do not support affirmative action for Blacks because of racism and perceived competition with Blacks.

This interpretation was not supported by our findings. On the one hand, White women were not necessarily more cognizant of discrimination toward Blacks. For example, White women were less likely than were White males to believe that there was racial discrimination in filling supervisory positions.

On the other hand, White women were more supportive of affirmative action programs than were White males. However, these differences were small when compared to interracial differences between Blacks and Whites.

Hypothesis 4: Class Differences Among Whites

Based on our examination of the research findings of Jackman (1981) and Klugel and Smith (1983), we hypothesized that well educated Whites would be more likely than would other Whites to support abstract applications of affirmative action. However, we believed that only minor differences would exist when affirmative action policies were expressed more concretely.

On balance, the findings of the survey supported our initial hypothesis. For example, middle or upper class Whites were more likely than were lower or working class Whites to believe racial discrimination continues as a problem for Blacks and that Blacks should receive "special breaks" in the future. As we

expected, the attitudes of affluent Whites were less liberal as questions became more concrete. For example, higher income Whites were more likely than were other Whites to support existing seniority systems and to oppose the establishment of special job training programs for minorities. It was somewhat surprising, that, among Whites, class had little effect on most responses to the questions about the extent of discrimination against Blacks at the workplace or in the community.

CONCLUSIONS

There are significant differences in the attitudes on affirmative action advanced by social groups. In large part, the differences uncovered in this research supported our major hypotheses.

We believe the attitudes held by social groups on affirmative action are important because they act (unfortunately at times) as partial guides to policymakers. Since most Whites are opposed to structurally oriented affirmative action policies, it is highly doubtful that affirmative action can ever address the more fundamental economic concerns of working class and unemployed Blacks, Hispanics, and women (e.g., job training programs, day care, etc.).

It should be remembered, however, that workplace affirmative action was not originally designed to meet the structural

concerns of victims of discrimination who are members of the working class. Instead, affirmative action, is a program, designed to assist relatively skilled groups enter and succeed in the labor market. The program has provided occupational advances for many White females, and some educated Blacks in the 1970's. But, on balance, relatively few Blacks have achieved high level professional and managerial positions in the public or private sector (Westcott, 1982). Moreover, researchers have consistently found that affirmative action has not significantly reduced the differences in earning between Blacks and Whites (King and Knapp, 1978; McCrone and Hardy, 1978; Taylor, 1981; and Westcott, 1982).

Given these findings, we believe affirmative action has perhaps been far more successful in promoting debate, than it has in increasing employment opportunities for a growing number of structurally unemployed Blacks.

Although affirmative action does not address the structural concerns of working class Blacks, Hispanics, and women, there is a demonstrative need for these programs. As we noted in our survey, racism and sexism continue to limit the hiring and promotion opportunities of powerless groups. Moreover, the widespread and disproportionate layoffs of minorities in the latest recession indicate the tenuous nature of previous gains made by these groups. Unfortunately, the government's half-hearted

enforcement of affirmative action policies is not addressing the concerns of Blacks in general, or Black female heads of households in particular (Terry, 1982).

In the future, the debate should shift from a concern over limited programs such as affirmative action to an examination of structural unemployment. Such a shift is required to meet the fundamental needs of working class Blacks, Hispanics, and women.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See: (EEOC, 1964)

[2] For more on income differentials between Blacks and Whites, see: Gwartney and Long (1978), King and Knapp (1978), and Hanushek (1982). McCrone and Hardy (1978) argue that the positive effects of affirmative action programs as operationalized by relative earnings is true only in the Southern states. Readers should also see U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1978) for data on racial and sexual discrimination.

[3] See: (Sowell, 1976:83). Sowell also suggests that affirmative action discourages employers from hiring minorities because of the possibility that a disgruntled minority employee might file a discrimination suit, See: Thomas Sowell, "Poor Aim in War on Bias," New York Times, August 11, 1981. Sowell also posits that "Affirmative action harms disadvantaged groups." See: "Affirmative Action Harms the Disadvantaged," Wall Street Journal, July 28, 1981. Sowell further asserts that minorities have derived "little real advantage from affirmative action and that the policy risks 'freezing' in the existing social structure" (1976). These quotes from Sowell have been used because he is one of the more thoughtful opponents of affirmative action.

[4] For a more theoretical explanation of this position, see Borgatta (1976). William Blackstone has stated that, "Although reverse discrimination might appear to have the effect of getting more persons who have been disadvantaged by past inequities into the mainstream quicker ... the cost would be invidious discrimination against majority group members of society" (1975:253-288). Moreover, opponents suggest that the standards in a system where positions are rewarded according to universalism/meritocracy will be lowered if group membership also influences employment selection (Gann and Rabushka, 1981:87).

[5] There was also a gradual liberalization in White attitudes on interracial marriage, school integration, and residential integration in Gallup and Harris polls taken between 1972 and 1980 (Public Opinion, Oct/Nov 1982). White attitudes also became more liberal on voting for a qualified Black presidential candidate and having a Black home for dinner (Public Opinion, Oct/Nov 1982). Several caveats should be kept in mind when examining these findings. First, these questions do not tap the same zero-sum dimension as affirmative action. Second, the voting behavior of Whites in the Chicago Mayoral election and the California gubernatorial election suggest the continuing influence of race. In fact, Whites have deserted their traditional voting patterns and supported White candidates who appear to be less qualified than their Black opponent (Thompson, 1984).

[6] McConohay (1982) found that White opposition to busing reflected the influence of early socialization and early political training. This early socialization and training had a continuing influence on White attitudes when busing surfaced as an issue in Louisville. However, the racist tinged values of the previous period were no longer acceptable when the busing controversy started. Accordingly, Whites in Louisville masked their true sentiments by offering contrived, but socially acceptable opinions, to express their opposition to busing.

[7] Also see "Blacks Believe White Women Lead in Job Gains," NEW YORK TIMES, March 25, 1982, p. B-14. It appears that there are even larger disparities between the post-affirmative action success of Black women when White women are divided into more specific ethnic groups. For example, Rodolfo Alvarez notes, "Certain ethnic groups have a disproportionate number of FEMALES as well as males with Ph.D.'s (1973:124-126).

[8] Jackman's thesis is not accepted by all writers. For example, Margolis and Hague (1981) suggest that education produces a greater commitment to racial integration than was found by Jackman. Moreover, they fault Jackman for confounding support for racial integration with distrust and fear of large government. Although Margolis and Hague advance some interesting points, we believe the rejoinder (1981) and original article (1978) by Jackman are more incisive.

- [9] A survey conducted in Los Angeles in May of 1982 found significant differences between the middle generation of Blacks (aged 30 to 44) and older or younger Blacks. The survey found that this middle generation "supports busing, but dislikes and distrusts Whites and is dissatisfied with life for Blacks today in significantly greater numbers than older and younger Blacks." In addition, the survey found that "Blacks between 30 and 44 are the least satisfied with conditions for Blacks and are the least optimistic about the future. Almost eight of every ten in this middle generation said conditions for Blacks in regard to housing, education, job opportunities, and social acceptance by Whites are 'not very good' to 'poor' compared to just more than half of other Blacks." See Sandy Banks, "Legacy of Rights Era: Cynicism," Los Angeles Times, August 25, 1982. The reader should also examine Hagner and Pierce (1984) to see how racial attitudes were influenced by the 1960's and 1970's.
- [10] For more on housing patterns in Washington, D.C. see Seltzer, McCormick, and Hill (1981).

[11] This finding is similar to that found in a survey of employees at the U.S. Department of Justice. The survey sought to determine the effectiveness of equal employment opportunity procedures in the agency. They found that only 15% of those experiencing discrimination who had taken their complaint to a counselor were able to resolve their complaint at this stage. The employees who did not file an EEO complaint cited the following reasons: 34% feared reprisal; 21% felt the complaint process was too long; 7% cited personal reasons; and 28% cited other reasons. It is clear, based on these figures, that few employees have great faith in EEO. Moreover, the experiences of employees at the Department of Justice suggests this lack of faith is justified by the performance of the EEO complaint process (See GAO, 1979:40-41).

[12] For example, William J. Wilson (1980:179-182) notes that the increasing economic gap between Blacks from different classes leads national civil rights organizations to support programs which do not address the more structurally related problems of the Black underclass. In addition, the reader should note that national social welfare policy has had the long-term effect of creating new patterns of economic stratification and political participation in the Black community. Economically, these policies have created a new class of Black poor increasingly dependent on the state for cash transfers. These transfers have helped create a new set of class relations between poor Black recipients of assistance, and Black middle class managers of the programs. Moreover, the class relations inherent from this arrangement have contributed to the development of "political factors (which) encourage the mobilization of the middle class and the withdrawal of the poor.... Social welfare policy seems to have created, (and may indeed sustain) economic and political stratification WITHIN the Black community" (emphasis in the original). (See Erie 1980:282, 284).

[13] See Lindsey Gruson, "Survey Finds 73 Percent Oppose Racial Quotas In Hiring," New York Times, September 25, 1983, p. 29.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alvarez R. (1973). Minorities and women in sociology: A comment. American Sociologist, 8, 124-126.
- Banks, S. (1982, August 25). Legacy of rights era: Cynicism. Los Angeles Times.
- Blackstone, W.T. (1975). Reverse discrimination and compensatory justice. Social Theory and Practice, 253-288.
- Bolce, L.H. III and Gray, H.S. (1978). Blacks, whites and race politics. The Public Interest, 61-75.
- Borgatta, E.F. The concept of reverse discrimination and equality of opportunity. The American Sociologist, 62-72.
- Cox, O.C. (1976). Race, caste and class. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Daniel, J. (1982). Relative occupational status of White women, Blacks, and Hispanics by industry. Report, Howard University School of Business and Public Administration, Washington, D.C.
- Duster, T. (1976) The structure of privilege and its universe of discourse. The American Sociologist, 11.
- Equal Employment Opportunity (1964). Legislative history of Title VII and IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office.
- Erie, S.P. (1980) Two faces of ethnic power: Comparing the Black and Irish experiences. Polity, 13, 261-284.
- Gann, L.H. & Rabushka, A. (1981). Racial classification: Politics of the future. Policy Review, 17, 87-94.
- General Accounting Office (1979). The Department of Justice should improve the equal employment opportunity programs. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Glazer, N. (1975). Affirmative discrimination: Ethnic inequality and public policy. New York: Basic Books.
- Glenn, N.D. (1975). Recent trends in White-nonwhite attitudinal differences. Public Opinion Quarterly, 38, 596-604.
- Goldman, A.H. (1975). Limits to the justification of reverse discrimination. Social Theory and Practice, 289-306.
- Gwartney, J.D. & Long, J. (1978). The relative earnings of Blacks and other minorities. Industrial and Labor Review, 31, 336-346.
- Hagner, P.R. & Pierce, J.C. (1984). Racial differences in political conceptualization. Western Political Quarterly, 37, 212-235.
- Hanushek, E.A. (1982). Sources of Black-White earning differences. Social Science Research, 11, 103-126.
- Jackman, M.R. (1981). Education and policy commitment to racial integration. American Journal of Political Science, 22.
- Jackman, M.R. (1978). General and applied tolerance: Does education increase commitment to racial integration? American Journal of Political Science, 31.

- Jacobson, C.A. (1983). Black support for affirmative action programs. Phylon, 44, 299-311.
- King, A.G. & Knapp, C. (1978). Race and the determinants of lifetime earnings. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 31, 347-354.
- Klugel, J.R. & Smith, E.R. (1983). Affirmative action attitudes: Effects of self-interest, racial affect, and stratification beliefs on Whites' views. Social Forces, 61, 797-824.
- Lipset, S.M. & Schneider, W. (1978, March/April). The Bakke case: How would it be decided at the bar of public opinion? Public Opinion, 38-44.
- Harris, Louis & Associates. (1978). Attitudes toward racial and religious minorities and women: A study. National Conference of Christians and Jews.
- McConahay, J.B. (1982). Self interest versus racial attitudes as correlates of anti-busing attitudes in Louisville: Is it the buses or the blacks? Journal of Politics, 44, 692-720.
- , & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? Journal of Conflict Resolution, 25, 563-579.
- McCrone, D. & Hardy, R. (1978). Civil rights policies and the achievement of racial economic equality. American Journal of Politics, 22, 1-17.
- Margolis, M. & Khondaker, H. (1981). Applied tolerance or fear of government? An alternative interpretation of Jackman's findings. American Journal of Political Science, 241-255.
- O'Neil, R.M. (1975). Discriminating against discrimination: Preferential admissions in the Defunis case. Bloomington: University Press.
- Opinion Roundup. (1981; April/May 1982; November 1982).
- Prothro, J.W. & Griggs, C.M. (1960). Fundamental principles of democracy: Bases of agreement and disagreement. Journal of Politics, 22, 276-294.
- Seltzer, R., McCormick, J. III & Hill, W. (1981). Housing conditions and attitudes toward housing and related issues in Washington, D.C. (Monograph). Washington, DC: Howard University, Department of Political Science.
- Smith, O.J. (1982, September). The politics of affirmative action and meritocracy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Denver, CO.
- Sniderman, P.M., Brody, R.A. & Kuklinski, J. (1984). Policy reasoning and political values: The problems of racial equality. American Journal of Political Science, 28, 75-94.
- Sowell, T. (1981, July 28). Affirmative action is harming the disadvantaged. Wall Street Journal.
- (1976) Dissenting from liberal orthodoxy: A Black scholar speaks for the angry moderates. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.

- (1981, August 11). Poor aim in war on bias. New York Times.
- Taylor, D.E. (1981). Education, on-the-job training, and the black-white income gap. Monthly Labor Review, 195, 35-43.
- Thompson, E. (1984). Black political organizations. Unpublished manuscript. University of Louisville.
- (1984). Race and the Chicago mayoral election. Journal of ethnic studies, 11, 1-12.
- (forthcoming). Race, class, and public policy. Journal of Black Studies.
- United States Commission on Civil Rights. (1981). Affirmative action in the 1980's: Dismantling the process of discrimination. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- (1981). Social indicators of equality for minorities and women. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Westcott, D.N. (1982). Blacks in the 1970's: Did they scale with the job ladder. Monthly Labor Review, 29-38.
- Wilson, W.J. (1980). The declining significance of race: Blacks and changing American institutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

TABLE 1*

Looking back over the course of the LAST TEN YEARS, do you think the quality of life of Blacks in the United States has improved a little, gotten slightly worse, or gotten a lot worse?

	improved a lot	improved a little	no improvement/ stayed the same*
Whites overall	33.6	54.7	11.7
age			
under 60	29.1	59.9	11.0
over 60	64.7	23.5	11.8
education			
hs grad or less	48.9	41.3	9.8
some college or more	28.9	58.3	7.0
Blacks overall	20.0	49.7	30.3
% employees at work are White			
under 6%	13.9	27.8	58.3
over 6%	22.3	58.0	19.7

* In these tables, except for race, we break down responses across a demographic variable only if that variable is significantly related to the question or attitude under investigation. The demographic variables we examine include race, sex, age, education, employment status, occupation, labor union membership, perceived chance of promotion, marital status, voter registration status, how the respondent voted in the 1980 presidential election, self-placement on a liberal-conservative scale, self-designation of class, number of employees at the respondent's job, percentage of employees at the job who are White or women, religion, the frequency of church attendance, whether the respondent has children, and where the respondent lives.

In addition, in order to save space not all subcategories of the demographic variables are reported. For example, in Table 1, age is divided into under 60 and over 60. This breakdown implies our finding that there was no difference across age between those younger than 60 and those older than 60.

TABLE 2

Looking back over the course of the LAST YEAR, do you think the quality of life of Blacks in the United States has improved a lot, improved a little, gotten slightly worse, or gotten a lot worse?

	total improved	stayed the same	total got worse
Whites overall	35.9	27.1	44.1
education			
hs grad or less	51.1	21.1	28.8
some col or more	31.1	23.6	42.4
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	44.3	22.7	32.9
Carter-Anderson	23.6	20.2	56.2
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	21.1	20.2	58.4
no	39.6	19.5	40.9
Blacks overall	26.1	8.2	65.6

TABLE 3

Racial discrimination is still a major problem facing
Blacks on the job market.

	total agree
Whites overall	68.3
self-designation of class	
working or lower class	54.7
middle or upper class	72.5
age	
under 25	74.4
over 25	67.5
education	
hs grad or less	59.5
some col or col grad	67.8
went to grad school	76.1
how voted in 1980	
Reagan	59.9
Carter-Anderson	79.2
Blacks overall	94.5

TABLE 4

Sexual discrimination is still a major problem facing
women on the job market.

	total agree
Whites overall	72.9
Blacks overall	86.9

TABLE 5

In the town in which you live would you say that Blacks and other minorities are discriminated against a lot, some, or not at all: in education?

	a lot	some	not at all
Whites overall	4.6	30.1	65.3
age			
under 40	4.5	37.7	57.8
over 40	5.0	17.9	77.1
education			
hs grad or less	2.3	22.1	75.6
some col or col grad	4.3	28.3	67.4
went to grad school	7.4	41.1	51.6
how frequent goes to church			
once a week or more	3.0	13.0	84.0
less than once a week or never	4.7	36.8	41.5
does respondent have children			
no	4.7	43.5	51.8
yes	4.5	18.7	76.8
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	0.0	15.6	84.4
Carter-Anderson	8.6	39.5	51.8
where respondent lives			
Washington, D.C.	8.4	44.2	47.4
Prince George's County	0.0	20.6	79.4
Montgomery County	5.0	29.7	65.3
Northern Virginia	3.8	23.8	72.4
Blacks overall	32.8	50.0	17.2
self designation of class			
working or lower class	39.1	48.7	12.2
middle or upper class	23.8	52.4	23.8
education			
hs grad or less	40.2	37.9	21.8
some col or col grad	26.5	63.9	9.6
went to grad school	25.0	43.8	31.3
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	26.8	62.0	11.3
no	37.6	40.4	22.0

TABLE 6

In the town in which you live would you say that Blacks and other minorities are discriminated against a lot, some, or not at all: in getting good jobs?

	a lot	some	not at all
Whites overall	11.0	45.3	43.7
% employees at work who are women			
0-39%	8.3	41.0	50.7
over 40%	14.5	51.3	34.2
education			
hs grad or less	6.3	35.4	58.2
some col or graduated col	8.7	47.3	44.0
went to grad school	19.0	50.0	31.0
how freq one goes to church			
once a week or more	5.1	28.6	66.3
less than once a week	12.9	50.8	36.3
does respondent have children			
no	12.1	53.8	34.1
yes	9.9	36.8	53.3
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	3.2	36.8	60.2
Carter-Anderson	17.8	48.4	32.7
where respondent lives			
Washington, D.C.	20.2	51.0	28.8
Prince George's County	6.6	41.0	52.5
Montgomery County	8.3	51.0	40.6
Northern Virginia	6.8	36.9	56.3
Blacks overall	50.3	42.3	7.4
member of labor union or not			
yes	70.3	24.3	5.4
no	43.0	50.0	7.0

TABLE 7

In the town in which you live would you say that Blacks and other minorities are discriminated against a lot, some, or not at all: in housing?

	a lot	some	not at all
Whites overall	9.2	34.8	56.0
marital status			
never married or sep	11.1	45.2	43.7
married, widowed or div	8.3	29.5	62.2
occupation			
professional	10.7	39.3	50.0
managerial	15.9	45.8	38.3
White col-nonprof	5.9	30.4	63.7
blue collar-serv	0.0	25.0	75.0
age			
under 40	8.9	41.3	49.8
over 40	10.0	24.3	65.7
education			
hs grad or less	2.3	19.8	77.9
some college or more	11.2	39.3	49.5
how freq one goes to church			
once a week or more	5.8	20.2	74.0
less than once a week	10.1	40.4	49.4
does respondent have children			
no	10.8	41.6	47.6
yes	7.7	28.6	63.8
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	4.1	24.7	71.1
Carter-Anderson	14.6	43.9	41.5
where respondent lives			
Washington, D.C.	23.0	47.0	30.0
Prince George's County	2.7	15.1	82.2
Montgomery County	5.6	36.6	57.4
Northern Virginia	3.7	35.2	61.1
Blacks overall	42.7	45.3	12.0
income			
under \$40,000	46.9	44.1	9.0
over \$40,000	12.5	54.2	33.3

TABLE 8

At your workplace, of the following categories is there a lot of racial discrimination against Blacks and other minorities, a little, or none at all: in hiring?

	a lot	a little	none
Whites overall	3.7	20.3	76.0
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	2.9	14.7	82.4
Carter	2.3	25.6	72.1
Anderson	10.0	32.5	57.5
Blacks overall	16.4	34.2	49.3
sex			
male	8.5	45.8	45.8
female	20.7	27.2	52.8
num of employees at workplace			
less than 100	17.4	23.9	58.7
over 100	14.3	51.8	33.9
% employees at work are White			
0-60%	8.4	26.3	65.3
over 60%	31.5	46.3	22.2
income			
under \$20,000	18.3	26.8	54.9
\$20,000-\$40,000	18.8	47.9	33.3
over \$40,000	0.0	25.0	75.0
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	27.0	34.9	38.1
no	9.2	34.5	56.3

TABLE 9

At your workplace, of the following categories is there a lot of racial discrimination against Blacks and other minorities, a little, or none at all: in promotions?

	a lot	a little	none
Whites overall	6.5	19.6	73.8
Blacks overall	23.8	36.7	39.5
sex			
male	13.8	48.3	37.9
female	30.7	29.5	39.8
% of employees at work are White			
0-39%	14.1	35.9	50.0
over 40%	32.5	36.3	31.3
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	37.1	37.1	25.8
no	14.5	36.1	49.4

TABLE 10

At your workplace of the following categories is there a lot of racial discrimination against Blacks and other minorities, a little, or none at all: in salaries?

	a lot	a little	none
Whites overall	6.1	11.5	82.4
Blacks overall	19.6	31.1	49.3
% employees at work are White			
0-39%	9.2	29.2	61.5
over 40%	28.8	31.3	40.0
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	13.3	1.7	85.0
no	4.0	13.8	82.1

TABLE 11

At your workplace of the following categories is there a lot of racial discrimination against Blacks and other minorities, a little, or none at all: in supervisory positions?

	a lot	a little	none
Whites overall	11.4	19.4	69.2
type of employer			
federal government	10.8	16.0	73.7
not federal government	13.1	26.2	60.7
sex			
male	8.9	24.4	66.7
female	14.1	14.1	71.9
% of employees at work are White			
0-60%	6.7	12.2	81.1
over 60%	14.5	23.0	63.6
does respondent have children			
no	9.1	28.0	62.9
yes	13.4	9.2	77.3
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	6.2	15.4	78.5
Carter-Anderson	16.0	26.9	57.1
where respondent lives			
Washington, D.C.	16.2	28.4	55.4
suburbs	9.5	15.9	74.6
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	21.7	10.0	68.3
no	8.7	21.9	69.4
Blacks overall	32.2	27.4	40.4
sex			
male	24.1	37.9	37.9
female	37.9	20.7	41.4
% employees at work are White			
0-60%	20.9	27.5	51.6
over 60%	53.8	25.0	21.2
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	43.5	21.0	35.4
no	24.1	32.5	43.4

TABLE 12

At your workplace of the following categories is there a lot of sexual discrimination against women, a little, or none at all in the following categories: hiring?

	a lot	little	none
Whites overall	4.7	17.8	77.5
where respondent was born			
D.C. or Virginia	3.2	7.9	88.9
Maryland suburbs	5.3	21.1	73.6
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	4.3	11.6	84.1
Carter-Anderson	7.0	24.0	69.0
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	12.5	18.8	68.8
no	2.4	16.6	81.0
Blacks overall	5.4	28.4	66.2
sex			
male	1.8	40.0	58.2
female	7.6	21.7	70.7
number of employees at work			
under 100	5.6	20.2	74.2
over 100	3.6	41.8	54.5
% of employees at work are White			
0-60%	2.2	19.4	78.5
over 60%	11.5	42.3	46.2
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	8.1	40.3	51.6
no	3.6	20.2	76.2

TABLE 13

At your workplace of the following categories is there a lot of sexual discrimination against women, a little, or none at all: in promotions?

	a lot	a little	none
Whites overall	7.0	26.7	66.3
does respondent have children			
no	4.7	34.5	60.8
yes	8.9	17.7	73.4
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	4.4	14.7	80.9
Carter-Anderson	10.9	35.9	53.1
where respondent lives			
Washington, D.C.	12.8	30.8	56.4
Prince George's County	3.8	11.5	84.6
Montgomery County	5.0	38.3	56.7
Northern Virginia	4.8	24.1	71.1
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	17.2	29.7	53.1
no	3.9	25.1	70.9
Blacks overall	12.6	31.5	55.9
perceived chance of promotion			
excellent	4.8	23.8	71.4
very good or fair	5.6	36.6	57.7
poor	31.4	25.7	42.9
sex			
male	5.6	42.6	51.9
female	17.0	25.0	58.0
income			
under \$20,000	14.9	20.9	64.2
\$20,000-\$40,000	13.0	47.8	39.1
over \$40,000	0.0	22.2	77.8
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	20.6	36.5	42.9
no	6.4	28.2	65.4

TABLE 14

At your workplace, of the following categories is there a lot of discrimination against women, a little, or none at all: in salaries?

	a lot	a little	none
Whites overall	5.5	23.7	70.8
sex			
male	3.5	20.3	76.2
female	7.6	27.5	64.9
where respondent born			
Washington, D.C.	4.7	2.3	93.0
born elsewhere	7.6	27.9	66.4
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	12.9	22.6	64.5
no	3.4	23.4	73.2
Blacks overall	15.5	23.2	61.3
labor union member or not			
yes	12.1	9.1	78.8
no	16.5	27.5	56.0
perceived chance of promotion			
excellent	9.5	9.5	81.0
very good, fair, or poor	17.3	26.9	55.8
sex			
male	5.6	21.5	63.0
female	21.8	18.4	59.8
% of employees at work are White			
under 6%	3.0	12.1	84.8
over 6%	19.8	26.4	53.8
income			
under \$20,000	12.1	18.2	69.7
\$20,000-\$40,000	21.7	37.0	41.3
over \$40,000	0	11.1	88.9
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	19.4	30.6	50.0
no	12.8	17.9	69.2

TABLE 15

At your workplace, of the following categories is there a lot of sexual discrimination against women, a little, or none at all: in supervisory positions?

	a lot	a little	none
Whites overall	8.0	28.1	63.9
number of employees at workplace			
less than 100	7.3	22.0	70.7
over 100	9.2	35.8	55.0
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	15.9	31.7	52.4
no	5.9	25.9	68.3
Blacks overall	14.8	30.3	54.9
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	19.4	35.5	45.2
no	11.4	26.6	62.0

TABLE 16

THOSE SAYING THEY HAD BEEN DISCRIMINATED AGAINST:
(At any place where you have worked have you personally ever been discriminated against because of your race or sex?)

	overall	racial	sexual	both
White males	12.4	5.2	2.6	3.1
White females	28.4	2.7	21.8	2.2
Black males	49.4	46.8	0	2.6
Black females	30.1	17.1	4.1	9.8

	present job not elsewhere	saying discrimination since Jan 1978
White males	33.3	81.0
White females	18.7	45.2
Black males	43.2	41.7
Black females	45.7	63.9

TABLE 17

NATURE OF DISCRIMINATION (of those saying they had been discriminated against)				
	hiring	promotions	salaries	other
White males	16.7	50.0	8.4	29.2
White females	26.6	48.4	42.2	15.9
Black males	36.1	61.1	36.1	19.4
Black female	5.3	63.2	23.7	31.6

TABLE 18

HOW RESPONDED TO DISCRIMINATION (of those saying they had been discriminated against)					
	quit job	nothing	filed complaint	other	complaint favorably resolved
White males	27.3	40.9	13.6	18.2	10.0
White females	19.7	37.7	23.0	19.6	19.3
Black males	13.5	26.2	16.2	44.1	14.3
Black females	21.6	18.9	21.6	37.9	25.0

TABLE 19

% SAYING THEY HAD BEEN DISCRIMINATED AGAINST				
	firms less than 20 employees	firms more than 20 employees	profs	non profs
White males	17.1	10.4	3.3	17.4
White females	52.5	29.0	36.4	32.7
Black males	37.5	55.6	61.5	46.2
Black females	38.5	33.3	59.1	23.7

	firms less than 60% of employees-White	firms more than 60% of employees-White
White males	17.1	9.6
White females	38.5	33.3
Black males	40.0	64.0
Black females	23.0	57.1

TABLE 21

The government should see to it that people who have been discriminated against in the past get a better break in the future.

	total agree
Whites overall	70.3
sex	
male	65.8
female	74.1
self designation of class	
working or lower class	63.1
middle or upper class	73.0
how voted in 1980	
Reagan	64.2
Carter-Anderson	73.8
Blacks overall	92.0
sex	
male	87.0
female	96.0
self designation of class	
working or lower class	95.9
middle or upper class	85.8
where respondent lives	
Washington, D.C.	94.5
Maryland	91.9
Northern Virginia	66.6

TABLE 21

Some large corporations are required to practice what is called affirmative action for Blacks and other minorities. This sometimes requires employers to give special preference to Blacks and other minorities when hiring. Do you approve strongly, approve somewhat, disapprove somewhat or disapprove strongly with affirmative action for Blacks and other minorities?

	total approve
Whites overall	69.2
self designation of politics	
liberal	76.7
conservative	64.1
how voted in 1980	
Reagan	53.8
Carter-Anderson	79.3
Blacks overall	85.1
self designation of politics	
liberal	91.2
conservative	76.8
income	
under \$40,000	84.8
over \$40,000	95.8

TABLE 22

How about affirmative action programs for women?

	total agree
Whites overall	69.4
self designation of politics	
liberal	77.1
conservative	62.7
how voted in 1980	
Reagan	54.7
Carter-Anderson	79.2
Blacks overall	85.6
self designation of politics	
liberal	90.4
conservative	82.1
occupation	
professional	94.3
non-professional	83.9

TABLE 23

Businesses should be required to set up special training programs for women, Blacks, and other minority groups.

	total agree
Whites overall	48.9
labor union member or not	
yes	67.5
no	44.4
type of employer	
self-employed	33.4
private industry	43.2
government or nonprofit	55.2
sex	
male	44.0
female	53.1
how voted in 1980	
Reagan	34.9
Carter-Anderson	69.5
income	
under \$20,000	63.5
over \$20,000	46.0
Blacks overall	78.4
self designation of class	
working or lower class	83.5
middle or upper class	68.1
income	
under \$20,000	84.2
over \$20,000	70.5
ever been discrim agnst	
yes	84.0
no	72.1

TABLE 24

Unless quotas are used Blacks and other minorities just won't get a fair shake.

Whites overall	total agree 39.5
sex	
male	33.3
female	44.7
how voted in 1980	
Reagan	26.2
Carter	44.1
Anderson	54.2
Blacks overall	75.7
self designation of class	
working or lower class	84.2
middle or upper class	63.8

TABLE 25

When layoffs occur in government and industry usually those hired last are fired first. Some argue that this discriminates against Blacks and women since they were often hired last because of past discrimination. Others argue that still the only reasonable way to decide is seniority. Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly, that those hired last should be fired first when layoffs occur even if more Blacks and women are laid off?

	total agree
Whites overall	61.6
sex	
male	73.1
female	51.8
% employees at work are women	
0-60%	65.4
over 60%	42.8
how voted in 1980	
Reagan	72.9
Carter-Anderson	55.4
income	
under \$20,000	45.9
\$20,000-\$40,000	62.6
over \$40,000	72.8
Blacks overall	42.3
perceived chance of promotion	
excellent or very good	31.1
fair or poor	48.8
sex	
male	50.7
female	37.2

TABLE 26

Giving special preferences to Blacks and other minorities when hiring will result in the hiring of unqualified individuals.

	total agree
Whites overall	47.7
sex	
male	52.9
female	43.3
education	
hs grad or less	51.6
some col or col grad	51.7
went to grad school	36.8
Blacks overall	33.3

TABLE 27

If there is no other way to achieve racial integration in the schools - busing of children should be used.

	total agree
Whites overall	43.3
age	
under 60	46.2
over 60	25.0
education	
hs grad or less	36.2
some col or col grad	38.5
went to grad school	57.7
how voted in 1980	
Reagan	29.9
Carter-Anderson	57.1
does respondent have children	
no	50.5
yes	36.4
where respondent lives	
Washington, D.C.	53.2
suburbs	39.7
Blacks overall	60.8
labor union member or not	
yes	51.2
no	65.1

TABLE 28

Of the following groups have they benefited a lot, some, or not at all from affirmative action programs: Whites?

	a lot	some	none
Whites overall	8.0%	48.5%	43.5%
sex			
male	6.3	40.9	52.8
female	9.5	55.2	35.3
self-designation of class			
working or lower class	9.5	62.2	28.4
upper or middle class	7.8	45.1	47.1
occupation			
professional	9.2	42.2	48.6
managerial	3.8	32.1	64.2
White collar-non prof	8.7	58.3	33.0
blue collar-service	2.9	67.6	29.4
num of employees at work			
under 100	9.2	51.6	39.2
over 100	4.3	40.0	55.7
education			
hs grad or less	12.2	59.8	28.0
some col or grad col	7.6	47.3	45.1
went to grad school	4.5	42.7	52.7
where respondent was born			
MD, VA, D.C., or South	7.3	56.7	36.0
elsewhere	8.8	41.5	42.7
income			
under \$20,000	13.2	63.2	23.7
over \$20,000	7.2	41.4	49.8
Blacks overall	33.7	42.8	23.5
marital status			
married or widowed	31.6	32.9	35.4
sep, div, or never mar	35.5	50.5	14.0
education			
hs grad or less	44.4	36.7	18.9
some col or grad col	23.8	52.5	23.8
went to grad school	23.5	29.4	47.1
religion			
Catholic	42.9	42.9	14.3
non-Baptist Protestant	31.3	29.2	39.6
Baptist	30.8	50.5	18.7
Atheist	50.0	37.5	12.5

TABLE 29

Of the following groups have they benefited a lot, some, or none at all from affirmative action programs: Blacks?

	a lot	some	none
Whites overall	27.9%	68.5%	3.6%
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	35.4	56.6	8.1
Carter	27.2	72.8	0.0
Anderson	18.8	76.6	4.7
where respondent lives			
Prince George's County	17.1	74.3	8.6
elsewhere	30.3	67.2	2.5
Blacks overall	25.7	67.0	7.3
sex			
male	36.8	55.3	7.9
female	18.4	74.6	7.0
marital status			
married	35.3	55.9	8.8
widowed, div, sep, nm	21.3	73.8	6.6
education			
hs grad or less	20.7	71.7	7.6
some col or col grad	24.4	68.3	7.3
went to grad school	58.8	35.3	5.9
religion			
Catholic	13.8	72.4	13.8
non-Baptist Protestant	40.0	54.0	6.0
Baptist	25.0	68.5	6.5
athiest	6.1	93.8	0.0
income			
under \$20,000	16.5	74.7	8.8
\$20,000-\$40,000	33.3	63.0	3.7
over \$40,000	41.7	45.8	12.5

TABLE 30

In your opinion have the major benefits of affirmative action programs among Blacks gone to: lower class Blacks, middle class Blacks, upper class Blacks, or all Blacks have benefited equally?

	lower class	middle class	upper class	all classes equally
Whites overall	12.7%	51.0%	16.1%	20.2%
political party				
Democrat	9.2	59.9	12.7	18.3
Republican	15.3	43.9	19.6	21.2
Blacks overall	14.5	41.9	26.3	17.3
sex				
male	23.9	35.2	26.8	14.1
female	8.4	46.7	25.2	19.6

TABLE 31

Of the following groups have they benefited a lot, some, or not at all from affirmative action programs: women?

	a lot	some	none
Whites overall	24.2%	69.1	6.7%
education			
hs grad or less	19.0	66.7	14.3
some col or grad col	26.2	69.6	4.2
went to grad school	24.1	70.5	5.4
Blacks overall	29.9	61.0	9.1
religion			
Catholic	17.9	64.3	17.9
non-Baptist Protestant	53.1	40.8	6.1
atheist	25.0	56.3	18.8
political party*			
Democrat	32.8	62.5	4.7
Independent	25.0	52.3	22.5

* there were not enough Black Republicans to analyse.

TABLE 32

Of the following groups have they benefited a lot, some, or not at all from affirmative action programs: Hispanics?

	a lot	some	none
Whites overall	10.3%	74.2%	15.5%
registered voter or not			
yes	11.9	73.4	14.7
no	1.9	76.9	21.2
education			
hs grad or less	10.1	60.9	29.0
some col or grad col	8.8	77.6	13.5
went to grad school	12.9	77.2	9.9
where respondent was born			
Maryland or D.C.	9.3	64.0	26.7
elsewhere	10.7	77.0	12.3
where respondent lives			
Washington, D.C.	14.0	64.5	21.7
Prince George's County	1.6	80.3	18.0
Montgomery County	8.1	75.6	16.3
Northern Virginia	13.9	78.2	7.9
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	12.9	63.5	25.5
no	9.0	79.5	11.5
Blacks overall	16.1	71.3	12.6
religion			
Catholic	0.0	80.0	20.0
non-Baptist Protestant	36.2	59.6	4.3
Baptist	10.8	74.7	14.5
atheist	13.3	73.3	13.3

TABLE 33

Of the following groups do you think they have opposed
affirmative action a lot, a little, or not at all: corporations?

	a lot	a little	not at all
Whites overall	33.7%	56.9%	9.4%
does respond have children			
no	38.1	55.0	6.9
yes	28.7	59.1	12.2
Blacks overall	38.1	51.4	10.5
religion			
Catholic	55.2	44.8	0.0
non-Baptist Protestant	27.5	58.8	13.7
Baptist	34.1	52.4	13.4
atheist	56.3	37.5	6.3
ever been discrim agnst			
yes	50.0	41.2	8.8
no	30.3	57.8	11.9

TABLE 34

Of the following groups do you think they have opposed affirmative action a lot, a little, or not at all: labor unions?

	a lot	a little	not at all
Whites overall	29.1%	49.3%	21.6%
Blacks overall	28.3	52.0	19.7
age			
18-40	33.0	47.8	19.1
41-59	10.3	64.1	25.6
over 60	38.8	55.6	5.6

TABLE 35

of the following groups do you think they have opposed affirmative action a lot, a little, or none at all: Whites?

	a lot	a little	none at all
Whites overall	27.6%	61.8%	10.5%
have children or not			
no	35.4	58.2	6.3
yes	19.5	65.8	14.7
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	21.4	64.3	14.3
Carter-Anderson	31.4	63.9	4.7
Blacks overall	56.5	37.5	6.0
self-designation of class			
working or lower	62.5	33.9	3.6
middle or upper	47.7	41.5	10.8
number of employees at work			
less than 100	43.8	49.4	6.7
over 100	70.4	25.9	3.7
religion			
Baptist	45.3	47.7	7.0
non-Baptist	67.0	27.7	5.3

TABLE 36

Of the following groups do you think they have opposed affirmative action, a lot, a little, or not at all: the wealthy?

	a lot	a little	not at all
Whites overall	45.9	29.8	24.3
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	29.2	32.6	38.2
Carter-Anderson	54.4	26.6	18.9
where respondent lives			
Washington, D.C.	50.5	34.3	15.2
Prince George's County	43.9	28.8	27.3
Montgomery County	54.3	23.4	22.3
Northern Virginia	35.5	31.8	32.7
Blacks overall	59.8	21.8	18.4
self-designation of class			
working or lower class	64.6	15.9	19.5
middle or upper class	50.9	31.6	17.5

TABLE 37

Of the following groups do you think they have opposed affirmative action a lot, a little, or not at all: Black middle class?

	a lot	a little	not at all
Whites overall	10.9%	37.3%	51.8%
% of emps at work are White			
0-60%	11.1	50.6	38.3
61-94%	7.5	29.2	63.3
over 95%	16.7	39.6	43.8
have children or not			
no	14.3	32.4	53.3
yes	6.9	42.5	50.6
how voted in 1980			
Reagan	10.3	48.3	41.4
Carter	10.9	33.6	55.5
Anderson	9.3	18.5	72.2
where respondent lives			
Washington, D.C.	13.4	22.7	63.9
Prince George's County	9.1	53.0	37.9
Montgomery County	10.0	42.2	47.8
Northern Virginia	10.6	36.5	52.9
Blacks overall	10.6	51.1	38.3
labor union member or not			
yes	22.2	50.0	57.8
no	6.7	49.6	43.7
education			
hs grad or less	14.0	64.0	22.1
some col or grad col	8.9	43.0	48.1
went to grad school	0.0	20.0	80.0
religion			
Catholic	27.6	48.3	24.1
non-Baptist Protestant	8.3	41.7	50.0
Baptist	7.2	57.8	34.9
atheist	0.0	62.5	37.5
income			
under \$20,000	14.0	62.8	23.3
over \$20,000	6.8	37.8	56.8

TABLE 38

Would you say that Blacks who have made it to the middle class tend to have great sympathy and concern for poorer Blacks, some sympathy and concern for poorer Blacks, or little sympathy and little concern for poorer Blacks?

	great sympathy	little sympathy	no sympathy
Whites overall	8.2%	61.2%	30.6%
employment status			
self-emp or private firm	10.4	56.6	32.9
state or local govt	3.6	46.4	50.0
federal govt on nonprofit	5.3	73.7	21.0
occupation			
prof or managerial	5.6	68.9	26.1
while col non prof or bc	11.6	51.4	37.0
age			
under 40	9.1	63.1	27.7
over 60	2.2	44.4	53.3
education			
hs grad or less	11.4	52.3	36.4
some col or col grad	7.4	60.0	32.6
went to grad school	7.3	70.9	21.8
have children or not			
no	11.9	62.4	25.8
yes	4.6	60.3	35.1
where respondent lives			
Washington, D.C.	5.0	73.0	22.0
suburbs	9.3	57.1	33.6
Blacks overall	10.7	42.3	46.9
self-designation of class			
working or lower class	6.7	37.8	55.5
middle or upper class	17.4	46.4	36.2
income			
under \$20,000	8.8	31.9	59.3
\$20,000-\$40,000	16.1	46.4	37.5
over \$40,000	4.2	62.5	33.3

OTHER SELECTED PUBLICATIONS

	<u>*Price</u>	<u>Bulk Rate</u>
An Analysis of Current Research Methods for Studying the Homeless. Norweeta G. Milburn, Roderick J. Watts, and Susan L. Anderson, 1984, pp. 44.	5.00	4.50
The Black Female Professional. Roberta Morse, (20), 1983, pp. 48.	4.00	3.50
Black Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. Robert C. Smith, 1983. pp. 97.	5.00	4.50
The Church as a Predictor of Black Social Participation in Voluntary Associations. Diane Robinson-Brown, 1982, (19), pp. 49.	3.00	2.50
The Criminal Victimization of the Elderly. Harvey L. McMurray, (21), 1983, pp. 47.	4.00	3.50
Pathways: A Study of Black Informal Support Networks. Lawrence E. Gary, Diane Brown, Norweeta G. Milburn, Veronica G. Thomas, & Donald S. Lockley, 1984, pp. 226.	5.00	4.50
Stable Black Families, Lawrence E. Gary, Lula A. Beatty, Greta L. Berry, & Mary D. Price, 1983, pp. 92.	5.00	4.50
Unmarried Black Adolescent Fathers and Their Controls: The Washington, DC Sample. Leo E. Hendricks, 1983, pp. 127.	5.00	4.50
Violence Against Blacks, 1979-1981. Elsie L. Scott, (22), 1983, pp. 58.	4.00	3.50

*Prices for individual copies and bulk rates (10 or more copies)
are subject to change.